GREEN'S HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE

Ex Libris
Universitatis
Albertaensis



THE LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

WITHDRAWN
FROM THE LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A HISTORY
OF THE
ENGLISH PEOPLE

BY JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M.A.

COMPLETE IN TEN VOLUMES



VOLUME VIII

1660-1683

FUNK *and* WAGNALLS COMPANY
New York and London

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

DA
30
.G79
v. 8

CONTENTS

BOOK VII.—*Continued.*

CHAPTER PAGE

XII.—The Protectorate. 1653–1660..... 5

BOOK VIII.

The Revolution. 1660–1683.

Authorities for Book VIII..... 61
I.—The Restoration. 1660–1667..... 64
I.—The Popish Plot. 1667–1683..... 139

81383

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.

BOOK VII.—*Continued.*

CHAPTER XII.

THE PROTECTORATE.

1653—1660.

1112. THE thin screen which the continuance of a little knot of representatives had thrown over the rule of the sword was at last torn away. So long as an assembly which called itself a house of commons met at Westminster, men might still cling to a belief in the existence of a legal government. But now that even this was gone, such a belief was no longer possible. The army itself had to recognize its own position. The dispersion of the parliament and of the council of state left England without a government, for the authority of every official ended with that of the body from which his power was derived; and Cromwell, as captain-general, was forced to recognize his responsibility for the maintenance of public order. The one power left in England was the power of the sword. But, as in the revolution of 1648, so in the revolution of 1653, no thought of military despotism can be fairly traced in the acts of the general or the army. They were, in fact, far from regarding their position as a revolutionary one. Though incapable of justification on any formal

ground, their proceedings since the establishment of the commonwealth had as yet been substantially in vindication of the rights of the country to representation and self-government; and public opinion had gone fairly with the army in its demand for a full and efficient body of representatives, as well as in its resistance to the project by which the Rump would have deprived half England of its right of election. It was only when no other means existed of preventing such a wrong, that the soldiers had driven out the wrong-doers. "It is you that have forced me to this," Cromwell exclaimed, as he drove the members from the house: "I have sought the Lord night and day that he would rather slay me than put me upon the doing of this work." If the act was one of violence to the little group who claimed to be a house of commons, the act which it aimed at preventing was one of violence on their part to the constitutional rights of the whole nation. The people had, in fact, been "dissatisfied in every corner of the realm" at the state of public affairs; and the expulsion of the members was ratified by a general assent. "We did not hear a dog bark at their going," the protector said years afterward. Whatever anxiety may have been felt at the use which was like to be made of "the power of the sword," was in great part dispelled by a proclamation of the officers. They professed that their one anxiety was "not to grasp the power ourselves, nor to keep it in military hands; no, not for a day;" and their promise to "call to the government men of approved fidelity and honesty" was to some extent redeemed by the nomi-

nation of a provisional council of state, consisting of eight officers of high rank, and four civilians, with Cromwell as their head, and a seat in which was offered, though fruitlessly, to Vane.

1113. The first business of such a body was clearly to summon a new parliament and to resign its trust into its hands. But the bill for parliamentary reform had dropped with the expulsion of the Rump; and reluctant as the council was to summon a new parliament on the old basis of election, it shrank from the responsibility of effecting so fundamental a change as the creation of a new basis by its own authority. It was this difficulty which led to the expedient of a constituent convention. Cromwell told the story of this unlucky assembly some years after with an amusing frankness. "I will come and tell you a story of my own weakness and folly. And yet it was done in my simplicity—I dare avow it was. It was thought then that men of our own judgment, who had fought in the wars, and were all of a piece on that account—why, surely, these men will hit it, and these men will do it to the purpose, whatever can be desired! And surely we did think, and I did think so—the more blame to me!" Of the 156 men, "faithful, fearing God, and hating covetousness," whose names were selected for this purpose by the council of state, from lists furnished by the Congregational churches, the bulk were men, like Ashley Cooper, of good blood and "free estates;" and the proportion of burgesses, such as the leather-merchant, Praise-God Barebones, whose name was eagerly seized on as a nickname for

the body to which he belonged, seems to have been much the same as in earlier parliaments. But the circumstances of their choice told fatally on the temper of its members. Cromwell himself, in the burst of rugged eloquence with which he welcomed their assembling on the 4th of July, was carried away by a strange enthusiasm. "Convince the nation," he said, "that as men fearing God have fought them out of their bondage under the regal power, so men fearing God do now rule them in the fear of God. . . Own your call, for it is of God; indeed it is marvelous, and it hath been unprojected. . . . Never was a supreme power under such a way of owning God and being owned by him." A spirit yet more enthusiastic appeared in the proceedings of the convention itself.

1114. The resignation of their powers by Cromwell and the council into its hands left it the one supreme authority; but by the instrument which convoked it provision had been made that this authority should be transferred in fifteen months to another assembly elected according to its directions. Its work was, in fact, to be that of a constituent assembly, paving the way for a parliament on a really national basis. But the convention put the largest construction on its commission, and boldly undertook the whole task of constitutional reform. Committees were appointed to consider the needs of the church and the nation. The spirit of economy and honesty which pervaded the assembly appeared in its redress of the extravagance which prevailed in the civil service, and of the inequality of taxation. With

a remarkable energy it undertook a host of reforms, for whose execution England has had to wait to our own day. The Long Parliament had shrunk from any reform of the court of Chancery, where 23,000 cases were waiting unheard. The convention proposed its abolition. The work of compiling a single code of laws, begun under the Long Parliament by a committee with Sir Matthew Hale at its head, was again pushed forward. The frenzied alarm which these bold measures aroused among the lawyer class was soon backed by that of the clergy, who saw their wealth menaced by the establishment of civil marriage and by proposals to substitute the free contributions of congregations for the payment of tithes. The landed proprietors, too, rose against a scheme for the abolition of lay patronage, which was favored by the convention, and predicted an age of confiscation. The "Barebones Parliament," as the assembly was styled in derision, was charged with a design to ruin property, the church, and the law, with enmity to knowledge, and a blind and ignorant fanaticism.

1115. Cromwell himself shared the general uneasiness at its proceedings. His mind was that of an administrator rather than that of a statesman, unspeculative, deficient in foresight, conservative, and eminently practical. He saw the need of administrative reform in church and state ; but he had no sympathy whatever with the revolutionary theories which were filling the air around him. His desire was for "a settlement" which should be accompanied with as little disturbance of the old state of things as possible. If monarchy had vanished in the

turmoil of war, his experience of the Long Parliament only confirmed him in his belief of the need of establishing an executive power of a similar kind, apart from the power of the legislature, as a condition of civil liberty. His sword had won "liberty of conscience;" but passionately as he clung to it, he was still for an established church, for a parochial system, and a ministry maintained by tithes. His social tendencies were simply those of the class to which he belonged. "I was by birth a gentleman," he told a later parliament, and in the old social arrangement of "a nobleman, a gentleman, a yeoman," he saw "a good interest of the nation, and a great one." He hated "that leveling principle" which tended to the reducing of all to one equality. "What was the purport of it," he asks, with an amusing simplicity, "but to make the tenant as liberal a fortune as the landlord? Which, I think, if obtained, would not have lasted long. The men of that principle, after they had served their own turns, would then have cried up property and interest fast enough." To a practical temper such as this, the speculative reforms of the convention were as distasteful as to the lawyers and clergy whom they attacked. "Nothing," said Cromwell, "was in the hearts of these men but 'overturn, overturn.'" In December, however, he was delivered from his embarrassment by the internal dissensions of the assembly itself. The day after the decision against tithes the more conservative members snatched a vote by surprise "that the sitting of this parliament any longer, as now constituted, will not be for the good

of the commonwealth, and that it is requisite to deliver up unto the lord-general the powers we received from him." The speaker placed their abdication in Cromwell's hands, and the act was confirmed by the subsequent adhesion of a majority of the members.

1116. The dissolution of the convention replaced matters in the state in which its assembly had found them; but there was still the same general anxiety to substitute some sort of legal rule for the power of the sword. The convention had named during its session a fresh council of state, and this body at once drew up, under the name of the Instrument of government, a remarkable constitution, which was adopted by the council of officers. They were now driven by necessity to the step from which they had shrunk, that of convening a parliament on the reformed basis of representation, though such a basis had no legal sanction. The house was to consist of four hundred members from England, thirty from Scotland, and thirty from Ireland. The seats hitherto assigned to small and rotten boroughs were transferred to larger constituencies, and for the most part to counties. All special rights of voting in the election of members were abolished, and replaced by a general right of suffrage, based on the possession of real or personal property to the value of two hundred pounds. Catholics and "malignants," as those who had fought for the king were called, were excluded for the while from the franchise. Constitutionally, all further organization of the form of government should have been left to this assembly; but the dread

of disorder during the interval of its election, as well as a longing for "settlement," drove the council to complete their work by pressing the office of "protector" upon Cromwell. "They told me," he pleaded afterward, "that except I would undertake the government, they thought things would hardly come to a composure or settlement, but blood and confusion would break in as before." If we follow, however, his own statement, it was when they urged that the acceptance of such a protectorate actually limited his power as lord-general, and "bound his hands to act nothing without the consent of a council until the parliament," that the post was accepted. The powers of the new protector, indeed, were strictly limited. Though the members of the council were originally named by him, each member was irremovable, save by consent of the rest; their advice was necessary in all foreign affairs, their consent in matters of peace and war, their approval in nominations to the great offices of state, or the disposal of the military or civil power. With this body, too, lay the choice of all future protectors. To the administrative check of the council was added the political check of the parliament. Three years at the most were to elapse between the assembling of one parliament and another, and, once met, it could not be prorogued or dissolved for five months. Laws could not be made, nor taxes imposed, but by its authority, and after the lapse of twenty days the statutes it passed became laws, even though the protector's assent was refused to them. The new constitution was undoubtedly popular; and the promise of

a real parliament in a few months covered the want of any legal character in the new rule. The government was generally accepted as a provisional one, which could only acquire legal authority from the ratification of its acts in the coming session; and the desire to settle it on such a parliamentary basis was universal among the members of the new assembly which met in September, 1654, at Westminster.

1117. Few parliaments have ever been more memorable, or more truly representative of the English people, than the parliament of 1654. It was the first parliament in our history where members from Scotland and Ireland sat side by side with those from England, as they sit in the parliament of to-day. The members for rotten boroughs and pocket-boroughs had disappeared. In spite of the exclusion of royalists and Catholics from the polling-booths, and the arbitrary erasure of the names of a few ultra-republican members by the council, the house had a better title to the name of a "free parliament" than any which had sat before. The freedom with which the electors had exercised their right of voting was seen, indeed, in the large number of Presbyterian members who were returned, and in the reappearance of Haselrig and Bradshaw, with many members of the Long Parliament, side by side with Lord Herbert and the older Sir Harry Vane. The first business of the house was clearly to consider the question of government; and Haselrig, with the fiercer republicans, at once denied the legal existence of either council or protector, on the ground that the Long Parliament had never been dissolved. Such

an argument, however, told as much against the parliament in which they sat as against the administration itself, and the bulk of the assembly contented themselves with declining to recognize the constitution or protectorate as of more than provisional validity. They proceeded at once to settle the government on a parliamentary basis. The "instrument" was taken as the ground-work of the new constitution, and carried clause by clause. That Cromwell should retain his rule as protector was unanimously agreed; that he should possess the right of veto, or a co-ordinate legislative power with the parliament, was hotly debated, though the violent language of Haselrig did little to disturb the general tone of moderation. Suddenly, however, Cromwell interposed. If he had undertaken the duties of protector with reluctance, he looked on all legal defects in his title as more than supplied by the general acceptance of the nation. "I called not myself to this place," he urged; "God and the people of these kingdoms have borne testimony to it." His rule had been accepted by London, by the army, by the solemn decision of the judges, by addresses from every shire, by the very appearance of the members of the parliament in answer to his writ. "Why may I not balance this providence," he asked, "with any hereditary interest?" In this national approval he saw a call from God, a divine right of a higher order than that of the kings who had gone before.

1118. But there was another ground for the anxiety with which Cromwell watched the proceedings of the commons. His passion for administration

had far overstepped the bounds of a merely provisional rule in the interval before the assembling of the parliament. His desire for "settlement" had been strengthened not only by the drift of public opinion, but by the urgent need of every day; and the power reserved by the "instrument" to issue temporary ordinances, "until further order in such matters, to be taken by the parliament," gave a scope to his marvelous activity of which he at once took advantage. Sixty-four ordinances had been issued in the nine months before the meeting of the parliament. Peace had been concluded with Holland. The church had been set in order. The law itself had been minutely regulated. The union with Scotland had been brought to completion. So far was Cromwell from dreaming that these measures, or the authority which enacted them, would be questioned, that he looked to parliament simply to complete his work. "The great end of your meeting," he said at the first assembly of its members, "is healing and settling." Though he had himself done much, he added, "there was still much to be done." Peace had to be made with Portugal, and alliance with Spain. Bills were laid before the house for the codification of the law. The plantation and settlement of Ireland had still to be completed. He resented the setting these projects aside for constitutional questions which, as he held, a divine call had decided, and he resented yet more the renewed claim advanced by parliament to the sole power of legislation. As we have seen, his experience of the evils which had arisen from the concentration of legisla-

tive and executive power in the Long Parliament had convinced Cromwell of the danger to public liberty which lay in such a union. He saw in the joint government of "a single person and a parliament" the only assurance "that parliament should not make themselves perpetual," or that their power should not be perverted to public wrong.

1119. But whatever strength there may have been in the protector's arguments, the act by which he proceeded to enforce them was fatal to liberty, and in the end to Puritanism. "If my calling be from God," he ended, "and my testimony from the people, God and the people shall take it from me, else I will not part from it." And he announced that no member would be suffered to enter the house without signing an engagement "not to alter the government as it is settled in a single person and a parliament." No act of the Stuarts had been a bolder defiance of constitutional law; and the act was as needless as it was illegal. One hundred members alone refused to take the engagement, and the signatures of three-fourths of the house proved that the security Cromwell desired might have been easily procured by a vote of parliament. But those who remained resumed their constitutional task with unbroken firmness. They quietly asserted their sole title to government by referring the protector's ordinances to committees for revision, and for conversion into laws. The "instrument of government" was turned into a bill, debated, and after some serious modifications read a third time. Money votes, as in previous parliaments, were deferred till

"grievances" had been settled. But Cromwell once more intervened. The royalists were astir again; and he attributed their renewed hopes to the hostile attitude which he ascribed to the parliament. The army, which remained unpaid while the supplies were delayed, was seething with discontent. "It looks," said the protector, "as if the laying grounds for a quarrel had rather been designed than to give the people settlement. Judge yourselves whether the contesting of things that were provided for by this government hath been profitable expense of time for the good of this nation." In January, 1655, with words of angry reproach, he declared the parliament dissolved.

1120. The dissolution of the parliament of 1654 was a turning-point in the relations of England and the army. As yet, neither the people nor the soldiers had fairly recognized the actual state of affairs. From the revolution of 1648 the sword had been supreme, but its supremacy had been disguised by the continuance of the Rump. When the Rump was expelled, the military rule which followed still seemed only provisional. The bulk of Englishmen and the bulk of the army itself looked on its attitude as simply imposed on it by necessity, and believed that with the assembly of a parliament all would return to a legal course. But the parliament had come and gone; and the army still refused to lay down the sword. On the contrary, it seemed at last to resolve to grasp frankly the power which it had so long shrunk from openly wielding. All show of constitutional rule was now at an end. The pro-

tectorate, deprived by its own act of all chance of legal sanction, became a simple tyranny. Cromwell professed, indeed, to be restrained by the "instrument;" but the one great restraint on his power which the instrument provided, the inability to levy taxes save by consent of parliament, was set aside on the plea of necessity. "The people," said the protector, in words which Strafford might have uttered, "will prefer their real security to forms." That a danger of royalist revolt existed was undeniable, but the danger was at once doubled by the general discontent. From this moment, Whitelock tells us, "many sober and noble patriots," in despair of public liberty, "did begin to incline to the king's restoration." In the mass of the population the reaction was far more rapid. "Charles Stuart," writes a Cheshire correspondent to the secretary of state, "hath 500 friends in these adjacent counties for every one friend to you among them." But before the overpowering strength of the army even this general discontent was powerless. Yorkshire, where the royalist insurrection was expected to be most formidable, never ventured to rise at all. There were risings in Devon, Dorset, and the Welsh marches, but they were quickly put down, and their leaders brought to the scaffold. Easily, however, as the revolt was suppressed, the terror of the government was seen in the energetic measures to which Cromwell resorted in the hope of securing order. The country was divided into ten military governments, each with a major-general at its head, who was empowered to disarm all papists and royalists, and to arrest sus-

pected persons. Funds for the support of this military despotism were provided by an ordinance of the council of state, which enacted that all who had at any time borne arms for the king should pay every year a tenth part of their income, in spite of the act of oblivion, as a fine for their royalist tendencies. The despotism of the major-generals was seconded by the older expedients of tyranny. The ejected clergy had been zealous in promoting the insurrection, and they were forbidden, in revenge, to act as chaplains or as tutors. The press was placed under a strict censorship. The payment of taxes levied by the sole authority of the protector was enforced by distraint; and when a collector was sued in the courts for redress, the counsel for the prosecution were sent to the Tower.

1121. If pardon, indeed, could ever be won for a tyranny, the wisdom and grandeur with which he used the power he had usurped would win pardon for the protector. The greatest among the many great enterprises undertaken by the Long Parliament had been the union of the three kingdoms; and that of Scotland with England had been brought about, at the very end of its career, by the tact and vigor of Sir Harry Vane. But its practical realization was left to Cromwell. In four months of hard fighting, General Monk brought the Highlands to a new tranquillity; and the presence of an army of 8000 men, backed by a line of forts, kept the most restless of the clans in good order. The settlement of the country was brought about by the temperance and sagacity of Monk's successor, General Deane. No

further interference with the Presbyterian system was attempted beyond the suppression of the general assembly. But religious liberty was resolutely protected, and Deane ventured even to interfere on behalf of the miserable victims whom Scotch bigotry was torturing and burning on the charge of witchcraft. Even steady royalists acknowledged the justice of the government and the wonderful discipline of its troops. "We always reckon those eight years of the usurpation," said Burnet, afterward, "a time of great peace and prosperity."

1122. Sterner work had to be done before Ireland could be brought into real union with its sister kingdoms. The work of conquest had been continued by Ireton, and completed after his death by General Ludlow, as mercilessly as it had begun. Thousands perished by famine or the sword. Shipload after shipload of those who surrendered were sent over sea for sale into forced labor in Jamaica and the West Indies. More than 40,000 of the beaten Catholics were permitted to enlist for foreign service, and found a refuge in exile under the banners of France and Spain. The work of settlement, which was undertaken by Henry Cromwell, the younger and abler of the protector's sons, turned out to be even more terrible than the work of the sword. It took as its model the colonization of Ulster, the fatal measure which had destroyed all hope of a united Ireland, and had brought inevitably in its train the revolt and the war. The people were divided into classes in the order of their assumed guilt. All who after fair trial were proved to have personally taken

part in the massacre were sentenced to banishment or death. The general amnesty which freed "those of the meaner sort" from all question on other scores was far from extending to the land-owners. Catholic proprietors who had shown no good-will to the parliament, even though they had taken no part in the war, were punished by the forfeiture of a third of their estates. All who had borne arms were held to have forfeited the whole, and driven into Connaught, where fresh estates were carved out for them from the lands of the native clans. No such doom had ever fallen on a nation in modern times as fell upon Ireland in its new settlement. Among the bitter memories which part Ireland from England the memory of the bloodshed and confiscation which the Puritans wrought remains the bitterest; and the worst curse an Irish peasant can hurl at his enemy is "the curse of Cromwell." But, pitiless as the protector's policy was, it was successful in the ends at which it aimed. The whole native population lay helpless and crushed. Peace and order were restored, and a large incoming of Protestant settlers from England and Scotland brought a new prosperity to the wasted country. Above all, the legislative union which had been brought about with Scotland was now carried out with Ireland, and thirty seats were allotted to its representatives in the general parliament.

1123. In England Cromwell dealt with the royalists as irreconcilable enemies; but in every other respect he carried fairly out his pledge of "healing and settling." The series of administrative reforms

planned by the convention had been partially carried into effect before the meeting of parliament in 1654; but the work was pushed on after the dissolution of the house with yet greater energy. Nearly a hundred ordinances showed the industry of the government. Police, public amusements, roads, finances, the condition of prisons, the imprisonment of debtors, were a few among the subjects which claimed Cromwell's attention. An ordinance of more than fifty clauses reformed the court of chancery. The anarchy which had reigned in the church since the breakdown of episcopacy, and the failure of the Presbyterian system to supply its place, was put an end to by a series of wise and temperate measures for its reorganization. Rights of patronage were left untouched; but a board of triers, a fourth of whom were laymen, was appointed to examine the fitness of ministers presented to livings; and a church board of gentry and clergy was set up in every county to exercise a supervision over ecclesiastical affairs, and to detect and remove scandalous and ineffectual ministers. Even by the confession of Cromwell's opponents the plan worked well. It furnished the country with "able, serious preachers," Baxter tells us, "who lived a godly life, of what tolerable opinion soever they were;" and, as both Presbyterian and Congregationalist ministers were presented to livings at the will of their patrons, it solved so far as practical working was concerned the problem of a religious union among Protestants on the base of a wide variety of Christian opinion. From the church which was thus reorganized all power of interference

with faiths differing from its own was resolutely withheld. Save in his dealings with the Episcopalians, whom he looked on as a political danger, Cromwell remained true throughout to the cause of religious liberty. Even the Quaker, rejected by all other Christian bodies as an anarchist and blasphemer, found sympathy and protection in the protector. The Jews had been excluded from England since the reign of Edward the First; and a prayer which they now presented for leave to return was refused by a commission of merchants and divines to whom the protector referred it for consideration. But the refusal was quietly passed over, and the connivance of Cromwell in the settlement of a few Hebrews in London and Oxford was so clearly understood that no one ventured to interfere with them.

1124. No part of his policy is more characteristic of Cromwell's mind, whether in its strength or in its weakness, than his management of foreign affairs. While England had been absorbed in her long and obstinate struggle for freedom the whole face of the world around her had changed. The Thirty Years' war was over. The victories of Gustavus, and of the Swedish generals who followed him, had been seconded by the policy of Richelieu and the intervention of France. Protestantism in Germany was no longer in peril from the bigotry or ambition of the house of Austria; and the treaty of Westphalia had drawn a permanent line between the territories belonging to the adherents of the old religion and the new. There was little danger, indeed, now to

Europe from the great Catholic house which had threatened its freedom ever since Charles the Fifth. Its Austrian branch was called away from dreams of aggression in the west to a desperate struggle with the Turk for the possession of Hungary and the security of Austria itself. Spain, from causes which it is no part of our present story to detail, was falling into a state of strange decrepitude. So far from aiming to be mistress of Europe, she was rapidly sinking into the almost helpless prey of France. It was France which had now become the dominant power in Christendom, though her position was far from being as commanding as it was to become under Louis the Fourteenth. The peace and order which prevailed after the cessation of the religious troubles throughout her compact and fertile territory gave scope at last to the quick and industrious temper of the French people; while her wealth and energy was placed by the centralizing administration of Henry the Fourth, of Richelieu, and of Mazarin, almost absolutely in the hands of the crown. Under the three great rulers who have just been named her ambition was steadily directed to the same purpose of territorial aggrandizement, and though limited as yet to the annexation of the Spanish and imperial territories which still parted her frontier from the Pyrenees, the Alps, and the Rhine, a statesman of wise political genius would have discerned the beginning of that great struggle for supremacy over Europe at large which was only foiled by the genius of Marlborough and the victories of the grand alliance.

1125. But, in his view of European politics, Cromwell was misled by the conservative and unspeculative temper of his mind as well as by the strength of his religious enthusiasm. Of the change in the world around him he seems to have discerned nothing. He brought to the Europe of Mazarin the hopes and ideas with which all England was thrilling in his youth at the outbreak of the Thirty Years' war. Spain was still to him "the head of the papal interest," whether at home or abroad. "The papists in England," he said to the parliament of 1656, "have been accounted, ever since I was born, Spaniolized; they never regarded France or any other papist state, but Spain only." The old English hatred of Spain, the old English resentment at the shameful part which the nation had been forced to play in the great German struggle by the policy of James and of Charles, lived on in Cromwell, and was only strengthened by the religious enthusiasm which the success of Puritanism had kindled within him. "The Lord himself," he wrote to his admirals as they sailed to the West Indies, "hath a controversy with your enemies; even with that Romish Babylon of which the Spaniard is the great underproper. In that respect we fight the Lord's battles." What Sweden had been under Gustavus, England, Cromwell dreamed, might be now—the head of a great Protestant league in the struggle against Catholic aggression. "You have on your shoulders," he said to the parliament of 1654, "the interest of all the Christian people of the world. I wish it may be written on our hearts to be zealous for that interest."

The first step in such a struggle would necessarily be to league the Protestant powers together, and Cromwell's earliest efforts were directed to bring the ruinous and indecisive quarrel with Holland to an end. The fierceness of the strife had grown with each engagement; but the hopes of Holland fell with her admiral, Tromp, who received a mortal wound at a moment when he had succeeded in forcing the English line; and the skill and energy of his successor, De Ruyter, struggled in vain to restore her waning fortunes. She was saved by the expulsion of the Long Parliament, which had persisted in its demand for a political union of the two countries; and the new policy of Cromwell was seen in the conclusion of peace. The peace, indeed, was dearly bought. Not only did the united provinces recognize the supremacy of the English flag in the British seas and submit to the navigation act, but that of Holland pledged itself to shut out the house of Orange from power, and thus relieved England from the risk of seeing a Stuart restoration supported by Dutch forces.

1126. The peace which was concluded with the Dutch in 1654 was followed by the conclusion of like treaties with Sweden and with Denmark; and on the arrival of a Swedish envoy with offers of a league of friendship, Cromwell endeavored to bring the Dutch, the Brandenburgers, and the Danes into a confederation of the Protestant powers. His efforts in this direction, however, though they never wholly ceased, remained fruitless; but the protector was resolute to carry out his plans single-handed. The defeat

of the Dutch had left England the chief sea power of the world; and in the first days of 1655, before the dissolution of the parliament, two fleets put to sea with secret instructions. The first, under Blake, appeared in the Mediterranean, exacted reparation from Tuscany for wrongs done to English commerce, bombarded Algiers, and destroyed the fleet with which its pirates had ventured, through the reign of Charles, to insult the English coast. The thunder of Blake's guns, every Puritan believed, would be heard in the castle of St. Angelo, and Rome itself would have to bow to the greatness of Cromwell. But though no declaration of war had been issued against Spain, the true aim of both expeditions was an attack on that power; and the attack proved singularly unsuccessful. Though Blake sailed to the Spanish coast, he failed to intercept the treasure-fleet from America; and the second expedition, which made its way to the West Indies, was foiled in a descent on St. Domingo. It conquered Jamaica in May; but the conquest of this lesser island, important as it really was in breaking through the monopoly of the New World in the south which Spain had till now enjoyed, seemed at the time but a poor result for the vast expenditure of money and blood. The leaders of the expedition, Blake and Venables, were committed to the Tower on their return in September; but Cromwell found himself at war with Spain, and thrown whether he would or no into the hands of Mazarin.

1127. In October, 1655, he was forced to sign a treaty of alliance with France; while the cost of his

abortive expeditions drove him again to face a parliament. But Cromwell no longer trusted, as in his earlier parliament, to freedom of election. The sixty members who were returned under the ordinances of union by Scotland and Ireland were simply nominees of the government. Its whole influence was exerted to secure the return of the more conspicuous members of the council of state. It was calculated that, of the members returned, one-half were bound to the government by ties of profit or place. But Cromwell was still unsatisfied. A certificate of the council was required from each member before admission to the house when it met in September, 1656; and a fourth of the whole number returned—one hundred in all, with Haselrig at their head—were by this means excluded on grounds of disaffection or want of religion. To these arbitrary acts of violence the house replied only by a course of singular moderation and wisdom. From the first it disclaimed any purpose of opposing the government. One of its earliest acts provided securities for Cromwell's person, which was threatened by constant plots of assassination. It supported him in his war policy, and voted supplies of unprecedented extent for the maintenance of the struggle. It was this attitude of loyalty which gave force to its steady refusal to sanction the system of tyranny which had practically placed England under martial law. In his opening address, Cromwell boldly took his stand in support of the military despotism wielded by the major-generals. "It hath been more effectual toward the discountenancing of vice and

settling religion than anything done these fifty years. I will abide by it," he said, with singular vehemence, "notwithstanding the envy and slander of foolish men. I could as soon venture my life with it as with anything I ever undertook. If it were to be done again, I would do it." But no sooner had a bill been introduced into parliament to confirm the proceedings of the major-generals than a long debate showed the temper of the commons. They had resolved to acquiesce in the protectorate, but they were equally resolved to bring it again to a legal mode of government. This, indeed, was the aim of even Cromwell's wiser adherents. "What makes me fear the passing of this act," one of them wrote to his son Henry, "is that thereby his highness's government will be more founded in force, and more removed from that natural foundation which the people in parliament are desirous to give him, supposing that he will become more theirs than now he is." The bill was rejected, and Cromwell bowed to the feeling of the nation by withdrawing the powers of the major-generals.

1128. But the defeat of the tyranny of the sword was only a step toward a far bolder effort for the restoration of the power of the law. It was no mere pedantry, still less was it vulgar flattery, which influenced the parliament in their offer to Cromwell of the title of king. The experience of the last few years had taught the nation the value of the traditional forms under which its liberties had grown up. A king was limited by constitutional precedents. "The king's prerogative," it was well

urged, "is under the courts of justice, and is bounded as well as any acre of land, or anything a man hath." A protector, on the other hand, was new in our history, and there were no traditional means of limiting his power. "The one office being lawful in its nature," said Glynne, "known to the nation, certain in itself, and confined and regulated by the law, and the other not so—that was the great ground why the parliament did so much insist on this office and title." Under the name of monarchy, indeed, the question really at issue between the party headed by the officers and the party led by the lawyers in the commons was that of the restoration of constitutional and legal rule. In March, 1657, the proposal was carried by an overwhelming majority, but a month passed in endless consultations between the parliament and the protector. His good sense, his knowledge of the general feeling of the nation, his real desire to obtain a settlement which should secure the ends for which Puritanism fought, political and religious liberty, broke in conference after conference, through a mist of words. But his real concern throughout was with the temper of the army. Under whatever spurious disguises he cloaked the true nature of his government from the world, Cromwell knew well that it was a sheer government of the sword, that he was without hold upon the nation, and that the discontent of his soldiery would at once shake the fabric of his power. He vibrated to and fro between his sense of the political advantages of such a settlement, and his sense of its impossibility in face of the mood of the army. His

soldiers, he said, were no common swordsmen. They were "godly men, men that will not be beaten down by a worldly and carnal spirit while they keep their integrity;" men in whose general voice he recognized the voice of God. "They are honest and faithful men," he urged, "true to the great things of the government. And though it really is no part of their goodness to be unwilling to submit to what a parliament shall settle over them, yet it is my duty and conscience to beg of you that there may be no hard things put upon them which they cannot swallow. I cannot think God would bless an undertaking of anything which would justly and with cause grieve them."

1129. The temper of the army was soon shown. Its leaders, with Lambert, Fleetwood, and Desborough at their head, placed their commands in Cromwell's hands. A petition from the officers to parliament demanded the withdrawal of the proposal to restore the monarchy, "in the name of the old cause for which they had bled;" and on the 8th of May, Cromwell anticipated the coming debate on this petition, a debate which might have led to an open breach between the army and the commons, by a refusal of the crown. "I cannot undertake this government," he said, "with that title of king; and that is my answer to this great and weighty business." Disappointed as it was, the parliament, with singular self-restraint, turned to other modes of bringing about its purpose. The offer of the crown had been coupled with the condition of accepting a constitution, which was a modification of the instru-

ment of government adopted by the parliament of 1654, and this constitution Cromwell emphatically approved. "The things provided by this act of government," he owned, "do secure the liberties of the people of God as they never before have had them." With a change of the title of king into that of protector, the act of government now became law: and the solemn inauguration of the protector by the parliament on the 26th of June, was a practical acknowledgment on the part of Cromwell of the illegality of his former rule. In the name of the commons the speaker invested him with a mantle of state, placed the scepter in his hand, and girt the sword of justice by his side. By the new act of government, Cromwell was allowed to name his own successor, but in all after cases the office was to be an elective one. In every other respect the forms of the older constitution were carefully restored. Parliament was again to consist of two houses, the seventy members of "the other house" being named by the protector. The commons regained their old right of exclusively deciding on the qualification of their members. Parliamentary restrictions were imposed on the choice of members of the council and officers of state or of the army. A fixed revenue was voted to the protector, and it was provided that no moneys should be raised but by assent of parliament. Liberty of worship was secured for all but papists, prelatists, Socinians, or those who denied the inspiration of the Scriptures; and liberty of conscience was secured for all.

1130. The adjournment of the house after his in

auguration, in the summer of 1657, left Cromwell at the height of his power. He seemed at last to have placed his government on a legal and national basis. The ill-success of his earlier operations abroad was forgotten in a blaze of glory. On the eve of the parliament's assembly, one of Blake's captains had managed to intercept a part of the Spanish treasure-fleet. At the close of 1656 the protector seemed to have found the means of realizing his schemes for rekindling the religious war throughout Europe, in a quarrel between the Duke of Savoy and his Protestant subjects in the valleys of Piedmont. A ruthless massacre of these Vaudois by the duke's troops roused deep resentment throughout England, a resentment which still breathes in the noblest of Milton's sonnets. While the poet called on God to avenge his "slaughtered saints, whose bones lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold," Cromwell was already busy with the work of earthly vengeance. An English envoy appeared at the duke's court with haughty demands of redress. Their refusal would have been followed by instant war, for the Protestant cantons of Switzerland were bribed into promising a force of 10,000 men for an attack on Savoy. The plan was foiled by the cool diplomacy of Mazarin, who forced the duke to grant Cromwell's demands; but the apparent success of the protector raised his reputation at home and abroad. The spring of 1657 saw the greatest, as it was the last, of the triumphs of Blake. He found the Spanish Plate fleet guarded by galleons in the strongly-armed harbor of Santa Cruz; and on the 20th of April he forced

an entrance into the harbor and burnt or sank every ship within it. Triumphs at sea were followed by a triumph on land. Cromwell's demand of Dunkirk, which had long stood in the way of any acceptance of his offers of aid, was at last conceded; and in May, 1657, a detachment of the Puritan army joined the French troops who were attacking Flanders under the command of Turenne. Their valor and discipline were shown by the part they took in the capture of Mardyke in the summer of that year; and still more in the June of 1658, by the victory of the Dunes, a victory which forced the Flemish towns to open their gates to the French, and gave Dunkirk to Cromwell.

1131. Never had the fame of an English ruler stood higher; but in the midst of his glory the hand of death was falling on the protector. He had long been weary of his task. "God knows," he had burst out to the parliament a year before, "God knows I would have been glad to have lived under my woodside, and to have kept a flock of sheep, rather than to have undertaken this government." Amidst the glory of his aims, Cromwell's heart was heavy with this sense of failure. Whatever dreams of personal ambition had mingled with his aim, his aim had in the main been a high and unselfish one; in the course that seems to modern eyes so strange and complex, he had seen the leading of a divine hand that drew him from the sheepfolds to mold England into a people of God. What convinced him that the nation was called by a divine calling was the wonder which men felt at every step in its

advance. The England which he saw around him was not an England which Pym or Hampden had foreseen, which Vane in his wildest dreams had imagined, or for which the boldest among the soldiers of the new model had fought. Step by step, the nation had been drawn to changes from whence it shrank, to principles which it held in horror. When the struggle began, the temper of the men who waged it was a strictly conservative temper; they held themselves to be withstanding the revolutionary changes of the king, to be vindicating the existing constitution both of church and state. But the strife had hardly opened when they were drawn by very need to a revolutionary platform. What men found themselves fighting for at Edgehill and Marston Moor was the substitution of government by the will of the nation for government by the will of the king, and a setting aside of the religious compromise embodied in the church of the Tudors, for a church which was the mere embodiment of the Puritan section of the people at large. Defeat drove England to the new model, and again it found itself drawn to a new advance. No sooner was the sword in the hand of the "godly," than the conception of religious purity widened into that of religious liberty, and the thought of a nation self-governed into the dream of a kingdom of God. Dunbar and Worcester, the strife with the houses, the final strife with the king, turned the dream into a practical policy. Every obstacle fell before it. Episcopal church and Presbyterian church alike passed away. The loyalty of the nation, the stubborn efforts of Cromwell

and Ireton, failed to uphold the monarchy. Lords and commons fell in the very moment of their victory over the king. Desperately as men clung to the last shadow of a parliament, the victories of Blake, the statesmanship of Vane, failed to preserve the life of the Rump. In the crash of every political and religious institution, the army found itself the one power in the land, and the dream of its soldiers grew into a will to set up on earth a commonwealth of the saints.

1132. In this resolve Cromwell was at one with the new model. Like every soldier in his army, he held that by the victories God had given them He had "so called them to look after the government of the land, and so intrusted them with the welfare of all His people, that they were responsible for it, and might not in conscience stand still while anything was done which they thought was against the interest of the people of God." But he never doubted that the nation would own its calling as zealously as his soldiers did. He had no wish to change the outer form of its political or its social life; he would maintain social distinctions as he would maintain parliaments. But the old institutions must be penetrated with a new spirit. Conscience and worship must be free. Holiness must be the law of England's life. Its rulers must be found among "godly men," and their rule must be widened beyond the common sphere of temporal government. The old distinctions of the secular and the spiritual world must be done away. In public and in private life the new government must enforce obedience to the

will of God. Socially, such a theory seemed realized at last in the administration of the major-generals. Never had Cromwell been so satisfied. The "malignants" who had so long trodden pious men under foot lay helpless at the feet of the godly. The "cavalier interest," which was but "the badge and character of countenancing profaneness, disorder, and wickedness in all places," was crushed and powerless. "Christian men" reigned supreme. Cromwell recalled how "it was a shame to be a Christian within these fifteen, sixteen, or seventeen years in this nation. It was a shame, it was a reproach to a man; and the badge of Puritan was put upon it!" But the shame and reproach were now rolled away. The Puritan was master in the land. All government was in the hands of godly men. Piety was as needful for an officer in the army, for a magistrate, for a petty constable, as for a minister of religion. The aim of the protector was that England should be ruled and administered by "the best," by men ruling and administering in the fear of God. In church as in state all that such men had longed to do could now be done. Superstitious usages were driven from the churches. No minister wore a surplice. No child was signed in baptism with a cross. The very pastimes of the world had to conform themselves to the law of God. The theaters were closed. Sunday sports were summarily abolished. There were no more races, no more bull-baitings, no more cock-fighting, no more dances under the May-pole. Christmas had to pass without its junketings, or mummers, or mince-pies.

1133. To the eyes of mere zealots the work of Puritanism seemed done. But Cromwell was no mere zealot. Strangely mingled with the enthusiasm of his temper was a cool, passionless faculty of seeing things as they actually were about him; and he saw that in its very hour of triumph the cause he loved was losing ground. From this effort to turn England into a kingdom of God, England itself stood aloof. Its traditional instincts were outraged by the wreck of its institutions, its good sense by the effort to enforce godliness by civil penalties, its self-respect by the rule of the sword. Never had England shown a truer nobleness than when it refused to be tempted from the path of freedom even by the genius of Cromwell, never a truer wisdom than when it refused to be lured from its tradition of practical politics by the dazzling seductions of the Puritan ideal. And not only did the nation stand aloof from Cromwell's work, but its opposition grew hourly stronger. The very forces which seemed to have been annihilated by the civil war drew a fresh life from the national ill-will to their conquerors. Men forgot the despotism of the monarchy when the monarchy and the parliament lay wrecked in a common ruin. They forgot the tyranny of Laud when the church was trampled under foot by men who trampled under foot the constitution. By a strange turn of fortune the restoration of the church and of the crown became identified with the restoration of legal government, and with the overthrow of a rule of brute force. And for such a restoration the vast majority of the nation were longing more and more.

The old enmities of party and sect were forgotten in the common enmity of every party and every sect to the tyranny of the sword. A new national unity was revealing itself, as one jarring element after another came in to swell the mass of the national opposition to the system of the protectorate. The moderate royalist joined hands with the cavalier, the steady Presbyterian came to join the moderate royalist, and their ranks were swelled at last by the very founders of the commonwealth. Nothing marked more vividly the strength of the reaction against the protector's system than the union in a common enmity of Vane and Haselrig with the partisans of the Stuart pretender.

1134. It was the steady rise of this tide of opposition in which Cromwell saw the doom of his cause. That it could permanently be upheld by the sword he knew to be impossible. What he had hoped for was the gradual winning of England to a sense of its worth. But every day the current of opinion ran more strongly against it. The army stood alone in its purpose. Papist and skeptic, mystic and ceremonialist, latitudinarian and Presbyterian, all were hostile. The very pressure of Cromwell's system gave birth to new forms of spiritual and intellectual revolt. Science, rationalism, secularism, sprang for the first time into vivid life in their protest against the forced concentration of human thought on the single topic of religion, the effort to prison religion itself in a system of dogma, and to narrow humanity, with all its varied interests, within the sphere of the merely spiritual. Nothing is more significant,

though to Cromwell nothing would have been more unintelligible, than the simple story which tells us how from the vexed problems, political and religious, of the times, men turned to the peaceful study of the natural world about them. Bacon had already called men with a trumpet voice to such studies; but in England at least Bacon stood before his age. The beginnings of physical science were more slow and timid there than in any country of Europe. Only two discoveries of any real value came from English research before the restoration; the first, Gilbert's discovery of terrestrial magnetism in the close of Elizabeth's reign; the next, the great discovery of the circulation of the blood, which was taught by Harvey in the reign of James. Apart from these illustrious names England took little share in the scientific movement of the continent; and her whole energies seemed to be whirled into the vortex of theology and politics by the civil war.

1135. But the war had not reached its end when, in 1645, a little group of students were to be seen in London, men "inquisitive," says one of them, "into natural philosophy and other parts of human learning and particularly of what had been called the new philosophy . . . which from the times of Galileo at Florence, and Sir Francis Bacon (Lord Verulam) in England, hath been much cultivated in Italy, France, Germany, and other parts abroad, as well as with us in England." The strife of the time, indeed, aided in directing the minds of men to natural inquiries. "To have been always tossing about some theological question," says the first historian of the Royal

Society, Bishop Sprat, "would have been to have made that their private diversion, the excess of which they disliked in the public. To have been eternally musing on civil business and the distresses of the country was too melancholy a reflection. It was nature alone which could pleasantly entertain them in that estate." Foremost in the group stood Doctors Wallis and Wilkins, whose removal to Oxford, which had just been reorganized by the Puritan visitors, divided the little company in 1648 into two societies, one at the university, the other remaining at the capital. The Oxford society, which was the more important of the two, held its meetings at the lodgings of Dr. Wilkins, who had become warden at Wadham College; and added to the names of its members that of the eminent mathematician Dr. Ward, and that of the first of English economists, Sir William Petty. "Our business," Wallis tells us, "was (precluding matters of theology and state affairs) to discourse and consider of philosophical inquiries and such as related thereunto, as physic, anatomy, geometry, astronomy, navigation, statics, magnetics, chymics, mechanics, and natural experiments; with the state of these studies, as then cultivated at home and abroad. We then discoursed of the circulation of the blood, the valves in the venæ lacteæ, the lymphatic vessels, the Copernican hypothesis, the nature of comets and new stars, the satellites of Jupiter, the oval shape of Saturn, the spots in the sun and its turning on its own axis, the inequalities and selenography of the moon, the several phases of Venus and Mercury, the improvement of

telescopes, the grinding of glasses for that purpose, the weight of air, the possibility or impossibility of vacuities, and nature's abhorrence thereof, the Torricellian experiment in quicksilver, the descent of heavy bodies and the degree of acceleration therein, and divers other things of like nature."

1136. To what great results this protest against the Puritan concentration of all human thought on spiritual issues was to lead none could foresee. But results almost as great were to spring from the protest against the Puritan dogmatism which gave birth to the latitudinarians. Whatever verdict history may pronounce on Falkland's political career, his name must remain memorable in the history of religious thought. A new era in English theology began with the speculations of the men he gathered round him in his country house at Great Tew in the years that preceded the meeting of the Long Parliament. Their work was, above all, to deny the authority of tradition in matters of faith, as Bacon had denied it in matters of physical research; and to assert in the one field as in the other the supremacy of reason as a test of truth. Of the authority of the church, its fathers- and its councils, John Hales, a canon of Windsor, and a friend of Laud, said briefly "it is none." He dismissed with contempt the accepted test of universality. "Universality is such a proof of truth as truth itself is ashamed of. The most singular and strongest part of human authority is properly in the wisest and the most virtuous, and these, I trow, are not the most universal." William Chillingworth, a man of larger if not keener

mind, had been taught by an early conversion to Catholicism, and by a speedy return, the insecurity of any basis for belief but that of private judgment. In his "Religion of Protestants" he set aside ecclesiastical tradition or church authority as grounds of faith in favor of the Bible, but only of the Bible as interpreted by the common reason of men. Jeremy Taylor, the most brilliant of English preachers, a sufferer like Chillingworth on the royalist side during the troubles, and who was rewarded at the restoration with the bishopric of Down, limited even the authority of the Scriptures themselves. Reason was the one means which Taylor approved of in interpreting the Bible; but the certainty of the conclusions which reason drew from the Bible varied, as he held, with the conditions of reason itself. In all but the simplest truths of natural religion "we are not sure not to be deceived." The deduction of points of belief from the words of the Scriptures was attended with all the uncertainty and liability to error which sprang from the infinite variety of human understandings, the difficulties which hinder the discovery of truth, and the influences which divert the mind from accepting or rightly estimating it.

1137. It was plain to a mind like Chillingworth's that this denial of authority, this perception of the imperfection of reason in the discovery of absolute truth, struck as directly at the root of Protestant dogmatism as at the root of Catholic infallibility. "If Protestants are faulty in this matter [of claiming authority] it is for doing it too much and not too little. This presumptuous imposing of the senses

of man upon the words of God, of the special senses of man upon the general words of God, and laying them upon men's consciences together under the equal penalty of death and damnation, this vain conceit that we can speak of the things of God better than in the words of God, this deifying our own interpretations and tyrannous enforcing them upon others, this restraining of the word of God from that latitude and generality, and the understandings of men from that liberty wherein Christ and his apostles left them, is and hath been the only foundation of all the schisms of the church, and that which makes them immortal" In his "Liberty of Prophesying" Jeremy Taylor pleaded the cause of toleration with a weight of argument which hardly required the triumph of the independents and the shock of Naseby to drive it home. But the freedom of conscience which the independent founded on the personal communion of each soul with God, the latitudinarian founded on the weakness of authority and the imperfection of human reason. Taylor pleads even for the Anabaptist and the Romanist. He only gives place to the action of the civil magistrate in "those religions whose principles destroy government," and "those religions—if there be any such—which teach ill life." Hales openly professed that he would quit the church to-morrow if it required him to believe that all that dissented from it must be damned. Chillingworth denounced persecution in words of fire. "Take away this persecution, burning, cursing, damning of men for not subscribing the words of men as the words of God; re-

quire of Christians only to believe Christ and to call no man master but Him; let them leave claiming infallibility that have no title to it, and let them that in their own words disclaim it, disclaim it also in their actions. . . . Protestants are inexcusable if they do offer violence to other men's consciences."

1138. From the denunciation of intolerance the latitudinarians passed easily to the dream of comprehension which had haunted every nobler soul since the "Utopia" of More. Hales based his loyalty to the church of England on the fact that it was the largest and the most tolerant church in Christendom. Chillingworth pointed out how many obstacles to comprehension were removed by such a simplification of belief as flowed from a rational theology, and asked, like More, for "such an ordering of the public service of God as that all who believe the Scripture and live according to it might, without scruple or hypocrisy or protestation in any part, join in it." Taylor, like Chillingworth, rested his hope of union on the simplification of belief. He saw a probability of error in all the creeds and confessions adopted by Christian churches. "Such bodies of confessions and articles," he said, "must do much hurt." "He is rather the schismatic who makes unnecessary and inconvenient impositions, than he who disobeys them because he cannot do otherwise without violating his conscience." The Apostle's Creed, in its literal meaning, seemed to him the one term of Christian union which the church had the right to impose.

1139. The impulse which such men were giving to

religious speculation was being given to political and social inquiry by a mind of far greater keenness and power. Bacon's favorite secretary was Thomas Hobbes. "He was beloved by his lordship," Aubrey tells us, "who was wont to have him walk in his delicate groves, where he did meditate; and when a notion darted into his mind, Mr. Hobbes was presently to write it down. And his lordship was wont to say, that he did it better than any one else about him; for that many times when he read their notes he scarce understood what they writ because they understood it not clearly themselves." The long life of Hobbes covers a memorable space in our history. He was born in the year of the victory over the Armada; he died in 1679 at the age of ninety-two, only nine years before the revolution. His ability soon made itself felt, and in his earlier days he was the secretary of Bacon, and the friend of Ben Jonson and Lord Herbert of Cherbury. But it was not till the age of fifty-four, when he withdrew to France on the eve of the great rebellion in 1642, that his speculations were made known to the world in his treatise "De Cive." He joined the exiled court at Paris, and became mathematical tutor to Charles the Second, whose love and regard for him seems to have been real to the end. But his post was soon forfeited by the appearance of his "Leviathan" in 1651; he was forbidden to approach the court, and returned to England, where he appears to have acquiesced in the rule of Cromwell.

1140. The restoration brought Hobbes a pension; but both his works were condemned by parliament,

and "Hobbism" became, ere he died, a popular synonym for irreligion and immorality Prejudice of this kind sounded oddly in the case of a writer who had laid down, as the two things necessary to salvation, faith in Christ and obedience to the law. But the prejudice sprang from a true sense of the effect which the Hobbist philosophy must necessarily have, whether on the current religion or on the current notions of political and social morality. Hobbes was the first great English writer who dealt with the science of government from the ground, not of tradition, but of reason. It was in his treatment of man in the stage of human development which he supposed to precede that of society that he came most roughly into conflict with the accepted beliefs. Men, in his theory, were by nature equal, and their only natural relation was a state of war. It was no innate virtue of man himself which created human society out of this chaos of warring strengths. Hobbes, in fact, denied the existence of the more spiritual sides of man's nature His hard and narrow logic dissected every human custom and desire, and reduced even the most sacred to demonstrations of a prudent selfishness. Friendship was simply a sense of social utility to one another. The so-called laws of nature, such as gratitude or the love of our neighbor, were, in fact, contrary to the natural passions of man, and powerless to restrain them. Nor had religion rescued man by the interposition of a divine will. Nothing better illustrates the daring with which the new skepticism was to break through the theological traditions of the older world than the

pitiless logic with which Hobbes assailed the very theory of revelation. "To say God hath spoken to man in a dream, is no more than to say man dreamed that God hath spoken to him." "To say one hath seen a vision, or heard a voice, is to say he hath dreamed between sleeping and waking" Religion, in fact, was nothing more than "the fear of invisible powers," and here, as in all other branches of human science, knowledge dealt with words and not with things.

1141. It was man himself who for his own profit created society, by laying down certain of his natural rights and retaining only those of self-preservation. A covenant between man and man originally created "that great leviathan called the commonwealth or state, which is but an artificial man, though of greater stature and strength than the natural, for whose protection and defense it was intended." The fiction of such an "original contract" has long been dismissed from political speculation, but its effect at the time of its first appearance was immense. Its almost universal acceptance put an end to the religious and patriarchal theories of society, on which kingship had till now founded its claim of a divine right to authority which no subject might question. But if Hobbes destroyed the old ground of royal despotism, he laid a new and a firmer one. To create a society at all, he held that the whole body of the governed must have resigned all rights save that of self-preservation into the hands of a single ruler, who was the representative of all. Such a ruler was absolute, for to make terms with

him implied a man making terms with himself. The transfer of rights was inalienable, and after-generations were as much bound by it as the generation which made the transfer. As the head of the whole body, the ruler judged every question, settled the laws of civil justice or injustice, or decided between religion and superstition. His was a divine right, and the only divine right, because in him were absorbed all the rights of each of his subjects. It was not in any constitutional check that Hobbes looked for the prevention of tyranny, but in the common education and enlightenment as to their real end and the best mode of reaching it on the part of both subjects and prince. And the real end of both was the weal of the commonwealth at large. It was in laying boldly down this end of government, as well as in the basis of contract on which he made government repose, that Hobbes really influenced all later politics.

1142. That Cromwell discerned the strength of such currents of opinion as those which we have described may fairly be doubted. But he saw that Puritanism had missed its aim. He saw that the attempt to secure spiritual results by material force had failed, as it always fails. It had broken down before the indifference and resentment of the great mass of the people, of men who were neither lawless nor enthusiasts, but who clung to the older traditions of social order, and whose humor and good sense revolted alike from the artificial conception of human life which Puritanism had formed, and from its effort to force such a conception on a people by

law. It broke down, too, before the corruption of the Puritans themselves. It was impossible to distinguish between the saint and the hypocrite as soon as godliness became profitable. Ashley Cooper, a skeptic in religion and a profligate in morals, was among "the loudest bagpipes of the squeaking train." Even among the really earnest Puritans prosperity disclosed a pride, a worldliness, a selfish hardness which had been hidden in the hour of persecution. What was yet more significant was the irreligious and skeptical temper of the younger generation which had grown up amid the storms of the civil war. The children even of the leading Puritans stood aloof from Puritanism. The eldest of Cromwell's sons made small pretensions to religion. Milton's nephews, though reared in his house, were writing satires against Puritan hypocrisy and contributing to collections of filthy songs. The two daughters of the great preacher, Stephen Marshall, were to figure as actresses on the infamous stage of the restoration. The tone of the protector's later speeches shows his consciousness that the ground was slipping from under his feet. He no longer dwells on the dream of a Puritan England, of a nation rising as a whole into a people of God. He falls back on the phrases of his youth, and the saints become again a "peculiar people," a remnant, a fragment among the nation at large.

1143. But with the consciousness of failure in realizing his ideal of government the charm of government was gone; and now to the weariness of power was added the weakness and feverish im-

patience of disease. Vigorous and energetic as Cromwell's life had seemed, his health was by no means as strong as his will; he had been struck down by intermittent fever in the midst of his triumphs both in Scotland and in Ireland, and during the past year he had suffered from repeated attacks of it. "I have some infirmities upon me," he owned twice over in his speech at the reopening of the parliament in January, 1658, after an adjournment of six months; and his feverish irritability was quickened by the public danger. No supplies had been voted, and the pay of the army was heavily in arrear, while its temper grew more and more sullen at the appearance of the new constitution and the reawakening of the royalist intrigues. Cromwell had believed that his military successes would secure compliance with his demands; but the temper of the commons was even more irritable than his own. Under the terms of the new constitution the members excluded in the preceding year took their places again in the house; and it was soon clear that the parliament reflected the general mood of the nation. The tone of the commons became captious and quarrelsome. They still delayed the grant of supplies. Meanwhile a hasty act of the protector in giving to his nominees in "the other house," as the new second chamber he had devised was called, the title of "lords," kindled a strife between the two houses which was busily fanned by Haselrig and other opponents of the government. It was contended that the "other house" had, under the new constitution, simply judicial and not legislative

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSI
OF ALBERTA

powers. Such a contention struck at once at Cromwell's work of restoring the old political forms of English life; and the reappearance of parliamentary strife threw him at last, says an observer at his court, "into a rage and passion like unto madness." What gave weight to it was the growing strength of the royalist party, and its hopes of a coming rising. Such a rising had, in fact, been carefully prepared; and Charles, with a large body of Spanish troops, drew to the coast of Flanders to take advantage of it. His hopes were, above all, encouraged by the strife in the commons, and their manifest dislike of the system of the protectorate. It was this that drove Cromwell to action. Summoning his coach, by a sudden impulse the protector drove on the 4th of February with a few guards to Westminster; and, setting aside the remonstrances of Fleetwood, summoned the two houses to his presence. "I do dissolve this parliament," he ended a speech of angry rebuke, "and let God be judge between you and me."

1144. Fatal as was the error, for the moment all went well. The army was reconciled by the blow leveled at its opponents, and a few murmurers who appeared in its ranks were weeded out by a careful remodeling. The triumphant officers vowed to stand or fall with his highness. The danger of a royalist rising vanished before a host of addresses from the counties. Great news, too, came from abroad where victory in Flanders, and the cession of Dunkirk in June, set the seal on Cromwell's glory. But the fever crept steadily on, and his looks told the tale of

death to the Quaker, Fox, who met him riding in Hampton Court Park. "Before I came to him," he says, "as he rode at the head of his life-guards, I saw and felt a waft of death go forth against him, and when I came to him he looked like a dead man." In the midst of his triumph Cromwell's heart was heavy, in fact, with the sense of failure. He had no desire to play the tyrant; nor had he any belief in the permanence of a mere tyranny. He clung desperately to the hope of bringing over the country to his side. He had hardly dissolved the parliament before he was planning the summons of another, and angry at the opposition which his council offered to the project. "I will take my own resolutions," he said gloomily to his household; "I can no longer satisfy myself to sit still, and make myself guilty of the loss of all the honest party and of the nation itself." But before his plans could be realized the overtaxed strength of the protector suddenly gave way. Early in August, 1658, his sickness took a more serious form. He saw too clearly the chaos into which his death would plunge England to be willing to die. "Do not think I shall die," he burst out with feverish energy to the physicians who gathered round him; "say not that I have lost my reason! I tell you the truth. I know it from better authority than any you can have from Galen or Hippocrates. It is the answer of God himself to our prayers!" Prayer, indeed, rose from every side for his recovery, but death grew steadily nearer, till even Cromwell felt that his hour was come. "I would be willing to live," the dying man mur-

mured, "to be further serviceable to God and his people, but my work is done! Yet God will be with his people!" A storm which tore roofs from houses, and leveled huge trees in every forest, seemed a fitting prelude to the passing away of his mighty spirit. Three days later, on the 3d of September, the day which had witnessed his victories of Worcester and Dunbar, Cromwell quietly breathed his last.

1145. So absolute even in death was his sway over the minds of men, that, to the wonder of the excited royalists, even a doubtful nomination on his death-bed was enough to secure the peaceful succession of his son, Richard Cromwell. Many, in fact, who had rejected the authority of his father, submitted peaceably to the new protector. Their motives were explained by Baxter, the most eminent among the Presbyterian ministers, in an address to Richard, which announced his adhesion. "I observe," he says, "that the nation generally rejoice in your peaceable entrance upon the government. Many are persuaded that you have been strangely kept from participating in any of our late bloody contentions, that God might make you the healer of our breaches, and employ you in that temple work which David himself might not be honored with, though it was in his mind, because he shed blood abundantly and made great wars." The new protector was a weak and worthless man; but the bulk of the nation were content to be ruled by one who was at any rate no soldier, no Puritan, and no innovator. Richard was known to be lax and worldly

in his conduct, and he was believed to be conservative, and even royalist, in heart. The tide of reaction was felt even in his council. Their first act was to throw aside one of the greatest of Cromwell's reforms, and to fall back, in the summons which they issued for a new parliament, on the old system of election. It was felt far more keenly in the tone of the new house of commons, when it met in January, 1659. The republicans, under Vane, backed adroitly by the members who were secretly royalist, fell hotly on Cromwell's system. The fiercest attack of all came from Sir Ashley Cooper, a Dorsetshire gentleman, who had changed sides in the civil war, had fought for the king and then for the parliament, had been a member of Cromwell's council, and had, of late, ceased to be a member of it. His virulent invective on "his highness of deplorable memory, who, with fraud and force, deprived you of your liberty when living, and entailed slavery on you at his death," was followed by an equally virulent invective against the army. "They have not only subdued their enemies," said Cooper, "but the masters who raised and maintained them. They have not only conquered Scotland and Ireland, but rebellious England, too; and there suppressed a malignant party of magistrates and laws."

1146. The army was quick with its reply. Already in the preceding November it had shown its suspicion of the new government by demanding the appointment of a soldier as general in the place of the new protector, who had assumed the command. The tone of the council of officers now became so

menacing that the commons ordered the dismissal of all officers who refused to engage "not to disturb or interrupt the free meetings of parliament." Richard ordered the council of officers to dissolve. Their reply was a demand for the dissolution of the parliament; and, with this demand, on the 22d of April, Richard was forced to comply. The purpose of the army, however, was still to secure a settled government; and, setting aside the new protector, whose weakness was now evident, they resolved to come to a reconciliation with the republican party, and to recall the fragment of the commons whom they had expelled from St. Stephen's in 1653. The arrangement was quickly brought about; and in May, of the 160 members who had continued to sit after the king's death, about ninety returned to their seats and resumed the administration of affairs. The continued exclusion of the members who had been "purged" from the house in 1648 proved that no real intention existed of restoring a legal rule; and the soldiers trusted that the Rump whom they had restored to power would be bound to them by the growing danger, both to republicanism and to religious liberty. But not even their passion for these "causes" could make men endure the rule of the sword. The house was soon at strife with the soldiers. In spite of Vane's counsels, it proposed a reform of the officers, and, though a royalist rising in Cheshire during August threw the disputants for a moment together, the struggle revived as the danger passed away. A new hope, indeed, filled men's minds. Not only was the nation sick of military

rule, but the army, unconquerable so long as it held together, at last showed signs of division. In Ireland and Scotland the troops protested against the attitude of their English comrades; and Monk, the commander of the Scottish army, threatened to march on London and free the parliament from their pressure. The knowledge of these divisions encouraged Haselrig and his coadjutors in the commons to demand the dismissal of Fleetwood and Lambert from their commands. They answered in October by driving the parliament again from Westminster, and by marching under Lambert to the north to meet the army under Monk.

1147. Lambert, however, suffered himself to be lured into inaction by negotiations, while Monk gathered a convention at Edinburgh, and strengthened himself with money and recruits. His attitude was enough to rouse England to action. Portsmouth closed its gates against the delegates of the soldiers. The fleet declared against them. So rapidly did the tide of feeling rise throughout the country that the army, at the close of December, was driven to undo the work by recalling the Rump. But the concession only aided the force of resistance by showing the weakness of the tyranny which England was resolute to throw off. Lambert's men fell from him, and finding his path clear, Monk, without revealing his purport, advanced rapidly to Coldstream, and crossed the border in the first days of 1660. His action broke the spell of terror which had weighed upon the country. The cry of "a free parliament" ran like fire through the country. Not

only Fairfax, who appeared in arms in Yorkshire, but the ships on the Thames and the mob which thronged the streets of London caught up the cry. Still, steadily advancing, but lavishing protestations of loyalty to the Rump while he accepted petitions for a "free parliament," Monk, on the 3d of February, entered London unopposed. From the moment of his entry the restoration of the Stuarts became inevitable. The army, resolute as it still remained for the maintenance of "the cause," was deceived by Monk's declarations of loyalty to it, and rendered powerless by his adroit dispersion of the troops over the country. At the instigation of Ashley Cooper, those who remained of the members who had been excluded from the house of commons in 1648 again forced their way into parliament, and at once resolved on a dissolution and the election of a new house of commons. The dissolution in March was followed by a last struggle of the army for its old supremacy. Lambert escaped from the Tower and called his fellow-soldiers to arms; but he was hotly pursued, overtaken, and routed near Daventry; and, on the 25th of April, the new house, which bears the name of the convention, assembled at Westminster. It had hardly taken the solemn league and covenant which showed its Presbyterian temper, and its leaders had only begun to draw up terms on which the king's restoration might be assented to, when they found that Monk was in negotiation with the exiled court. All exaction of terms was now impossible; a declaration from Breda, in which Charles promised a general pardon, religious toleration, and

satisfaction to the army, was received with a burst of national enthusiasm; and the old constitution was restored by a solemn vote of the convention, "that, according to the ancient and fundamental laws of this kingdom, the government is, and ought to be, by king, lords, and commons." The king was at once invited to hasten to his realm; and, on the 25th of May, Charles landed at Dover, and made his way, amid the shouts of a great multitude, to Whitehall. "It is my own fault," laughed the new king, with characteristic irony, "that I had not come back sooner; for I find nobody who does not tell me he has always longed for my return."

1148. In his progress to the capital, Charles passed in review the soldiers assembled on Blackheath. Betrayed by their general, abandoned by their leaders, surrounded as they were by a nation in arms, the gloomy silence of their ranks awed even the careless king with a sense of danger. But none of the victories of the new model were so glorious as the victory which it won over itself. Quietly, and without a struggle, as men who bowed to the inscrutable will of God, the farmers and traders who had dashed Rupert's chivalry to pieces on Naseby field, who had scattered at Worcester the "army of the aliens," and driven into helpless flight the sovereign that now came "to enjoy his own again," who had renewed beyond sea the glories of Cressy and Agincourt, had mastered the parliament, had brought a king to justice and the block, had given laws to England, and held even Cromwell in awe, became farmers and traders again, and were known among

their fellow-men by no other sign than their greater soberness and industry. And, with them Puritanism laid down the sword. It ceased from the long attempt to build up a kingdom of God by force and violence, and fell back on its truer work of building up a kingdom of righteousness in the hearts and consciences of men. It was from the moment of its seeming fall that its real victory began. As soon as the wild orgy of the restoration was over, men began to see that nothing that was really worthy in the work of Puritanism had been undone. The revels of Whitehall, the skepticism and debauchery of courtiers, the corruption of statesmen, left the mass of Englishmen what Puritanism had made them, serious, earnest, sober in life and conduct, firm in their love of Protestantism and of freedom. In the revolution of 1688, Puritanism did the workof civil liberty which it had failed to do in that of 1642. It wrought out through Wesley and the revival of the eighteenth century the work of religious reform which its earlier efforts had only thrown back for a hundred years. Slowly but steadily it introduced its own seriousness and purity into English society, English literature, English politics. The history of English progress since the restoration, on its moral and spiritual sides, has been the history of Puritanism.

BOOK VIII.

THE REVOLUTION.

(1660—1683.)

AUTHORITIES FOR BOOK VIII.

1149. The social change of the restoration is illustrated by the picture of court life in Anthony Hamilton's "Memoirs of the Count de Grammont," by the memoirs of Reresby, Pepys, and Evelyn, and the dramatic works of Wycherly and Etherege. For the general character of its comedy see Lord Macaulay's "Essay on the Dramatists of the Restoration." The histories of the Royal Society by Thompson or Wade, with Sir D. Brewster's "Biography of Newton," preserve the earlier annals of English science, which are condensed by Hallam in his "Literary History" (vol. iv.). Clarendon gives a detailed account of his own ministry in his "Life," which forms a continuation of his "History of the Rebellion." The relations of the church and the dissenters during this period may be seen in Neal's "History of the Puritans," Calamy's "Memoirs of the Ejected Ministers," Mr. Dixon's "Life of Penn," Baxter's "Autobiography," and Bunyan's account of his sufferings, in his various works. For the political story of the period as a whole, our best au-

thorities are Bishop Kennet's "Register," and Burnet's lively "History of My Own Times." The memoirs of Sir W. Temple, with his correspondence, are of great value up to their close in 1679. Mr. Christie's "Life of Shaftesbury" is a defense, and, in some ways, a successful defense, of that statesman's career, and of the whig policy at this time, which may be studied also in Earl Russell's life of his ancestor, William, Lord Russell. To these we may add the fragments of James the Second's autobiography preserved in Macpherson's "Original Papers" (of very various degrees of value), the "Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland," by Dalrymple, the first to discover the real secret of the negotiations with France, M. Mignet's "Négotiations Relatives à la Succession d'Espagne," a work indispensable for a knowledge of foreign affairs during this period, Welwood's "Memoirs," and Luttrell's "Diary."

1150. Throughout the whole reign of Charles the Second, Hallam's "Constitutional History" is singularly judicious and full in its information. Lingard becomes of importance during this period from the original materials to which he has had access, as well as from his clear and dispassionate statement of the Catholic side of the question. Ranke, in his "History of the Seventeenth Century," has thrown great light on the diplomatic history of the later Stuart reigns; on internal and constitutional points he is cool and dispassionate but of less value. The great work of Lord Macaulay, which practically ends at the peace of Ryswick, is continued by Lord Stanhope in his "History of England under Queen

Anne," and his "History of England from the Peace of Utrecht." For Marlborough, the main authority must be the duke's biography by Archdeacon Coxe with his "Dispatches." The character of the tory opposition may be studied in Swift's journal to Stella, and his political tracts, as well as in Bolingbroke's correspondence. The French side of the war and negotiations has been given by M. Henri Martin ("Histoire de France") in what is the most accurate and judicious portion of his work. For the earlier period of the Georges, Coxe's "Life of Sir Robert Walpole," Horace Walpole's "Memoirs of the Reign of George the Second," and Lord Hervey's amusing "Memoirs from the Accession of George the Second to the Death of Queen Caroline," give the main materials on the one side; Bolingbroke's "Patriot King," his "Letter to Sir W. Wyndham," and his correspondence afford some insight into the other. Horace Walpole's "Letters to Sir Horace Mann" give a minute account of his father's fall.

1151. For the elder Pitt we have the Chatham correspondence, a life by Thackeray, and two brilliant essays by Lord Macaulay. Another of Lord Macaulay's essays may be used, with Sir John Malcolm's biography, for the life of Lord Clive and the early history of British India, a fuller account of which may, of course, be found in general histories of India, such as that by James Mill. Carlyle's "Frederick the Great" contains a picturesque recital of the Seven Years' war, and of England's share in it; while the earlier relations of England and Frederick may be studied more coolly and thoroughly in

Ranke's "Nine Books of Prussian History," published in an English version under the name of his 'History of Prussia." The earlier part of the "Annual Register," which begins in 1758, has been attributed to Burke. Southey's biography, or the more elaborate life by Tyerman, gives an account of Wesley and the movement he headed.

CHAPTER I.

THE RESTORATION.

1660—1667.

1152. THE entry of Charles the Second into Whitehall marked a deep and lasting change in the temper of the English people. With it modern England began. The influences which had up to this time molded our history, the theological influence of the reformation, the monarchical influence of the new kingship, the feudal influence of the Middle Ages, the yet earlier influence of tradition and custom, suddenly lost power over the minds of men. From the moment of the restoration we find ourselves all at once among the great currents of thought and activity, which have gone on widening and deepening from that time to this. The England around us becomes our own England, an England whose chief forces are industry and science, the love of popular freedom and of law, an England which presses steadily forward to a larger social justice and equality, and which tends more and more to bring every

custom and tradition, religious, intellectual, and political, to the test of pure reason.

1153. Between modern thought, on some at least of its more important sides, and the thought of men before the restoration, there is a great gulf fixed. A political thinker in the present day would find it equally hard to discuss any point of statesmanship with Lord Burleigh or with Oliver Cromwell. He would find no point of contact between their ideas of national life or national welfare, their conception of government or the ends of government, their mode of regarding economical and social questions, and his own. But no gulf of this sort parts us from the men who followed the restoration. From that time to this, whatever differences there may have been as to the practical conclusions drawn from them, there has been a substantial agreement as to the grounds of our political, our social, our intellectual, and religious life. Paley would have found no difficulty in understanding Tillotson. Newton and Sir Humphrey Davy could have talked together without a sense of severance. There would have been nothing to hinder a perfectly clear discussion on government or law between John Locke and Jeremy Bentham.

1154. The change from the old England to the new is so startling that we are apt to look on it as a more sudden change than it really was; and the outer aspect of the restoration does much to strengthen this impression of suddenness. The whole face of England was changed in an instant. All that was noblest and best in Puritanism was whirled

away with its pettiness and its tyranny in the current of the nation's hate. Religion had been turned into a system of political and social oppression, and it fell with that system's fall. Godliness became a byword of scorn; sobriety in dress, in speech, in manners, was flouted as a mark of the detested Puritanism. Butler, in his "Hudibras," poured insult on the past with a pedantic buffoonery for which the general hatred, far more than its humor, secured a hearing. Archbishop Sheldon listened to the mock sermon of a cavalier who held up the Puritan phrase and the Puritan twang to ridicule in his hall at Lambeth. Dueling and raking became the marks of a fine gentleman; and grave divines winked at the follies of "honest fellows" who fought, gambled, swore, drank, and ended a day of debauchery by a night in the gutter. Life among men of fashion vibrated between frivolity and excess. One of the comedies of the time tells the courtier that "he must dress well, dance well, fence well, have a talent for love-letters, an agreeable voice, be amorous and discreet—but not too constant." To graces such as these the rakes of the restoration added a shamelessness and a brutality which passes belief. Lord Rochester was a fashionable poet, and the titles of some of his poems are such as no pen of our day could copy. Sir Charles Sedley was a fashionable wit, and the foulness of his words made even the porters of Covent Garden pelt him from the balcony when he ventured to address them. The Duke of Buckingham is a fair type of the time, and the most characteristic event in the duke's life was a

duel in which he consummated his seduction of Lady Shrewsbury by killing her husband, while the countess in disguise as a page held his horse for him and looked on at the murder.

1155. Vicious as the stage was when it opened its doors again on the fall of the commonwealth, it only reflected the general vice of the day. The comedy of the restoration borrowed everything from the contemporary comedy of France save the poetry, the delicacy, and good taste which there veiled its grossness. Seduction, intrigue, brutality, cynicism, debauchery, found fitting expression on the English stage in dialogue of a studied and deliberate foulness, which even its wit fails to redeem from disgust. Wycherly, the popular playwright of the time, remains the most brutal among all dramatists; and nothing gives so damning an impression of his day as the fact that he found actors to repeat his words and audiences to applaud them. Men such as Wycherly gave Milton models for the Belial of his great poem, "than whom a spirit more lewd fell not from heaven, or more gross to love vice for itself." The dramatist piques himself on the frankness and "plain dealing" which painted the world as he saw it, a world of brawls and assignations, of orgies at Vauxhall and fights with the watch, of lies and doubles-entendres, of knaves and dupes, of men who sold their daughters, and women who cheated their husbands. But the cynicism of Wycherly was no greater than that of the men about him; and in mere love of what was vile, in contempt of virtue

and disbelief in purity or honesty, the king himself stood ahead of any of his subjects.

1156. It is easy, however, to exaggerate the extent of this reaction. So far as we can judge from the memoirs of the time, its more violent forms were practically confined to the capital and the court. The mass of Englishmen were satisfied with getting back their May-poles and mince-pies; and a large part of the people remained Puritan in life and belief, though they threw aside many of the outer characteristics of Puritanism. Nor was the revolution in feeling as sudden as it seemed. Even if the political strength of Puritanism had remained unbroken, its social influence must soon have ceased. The young Englishmen who grew up in the midst of civil war knew nothing of the bitter tyranny which gave its zeal and fire to the religion of their fathers. From the social and religious anarchy around them, from the endless controversies and discussions of the time, they drank in the spirit of skepticism, of doubt, of free inquiry. If religious enthusiasm had broken the spell of ecclesiastical tradition, its own extravagance broke the spell of religious enthusiasm; and the new generation turned in disgust to try forms of political government and spiritual belief by the cooler and less fallible test of reason.

1157. It is this rationalizing tendency of the popular mind, this indifference to the traditions and ideals of the past, this practical and experimental temper, which found its highest expression in the sudden popularity of the pursuit of physical science. Of the two little companies of inquirers whom we

have already noticed as gathering at the close of the civil war, that which remained in the capital, and had at last been broken up by the troubles of the second protectorate, was revived at the restoration by the return to London of the more eminent members of the group which had assembled at Oxford. But the little company of philosophers had hardly begun their meetings at Gresham College when they found themselves objects of a general interest. Science suddenly became the fashion of the day. Charles the Second was himself a fair chemist, and took a keen interest in the problems of navigation. The Duke of Buckingham varied his freaks of rhyming, drinking, and fiddling, by fits of devotion to his laboratory. Poets like Dryden and Cowley courtiers like Sir Robert Murray and Sir Kenelm Digby, joined the scientific company to which, in token of his sympathy with it, the king gave the title of the "Royal Society." The curious glass toys called Prince Rupert's drops recall the scientific inquiries which amused the old age of the great cavalry-leader of the civil war. Wits and fops crowded to the meetings of the new society. Statesmen like Lord Somers felt honored at being chosen its presidents.

1158. The definite establishment of the Royal Society, in 1662, marks the opening of a great age of scientific discovery in England. Almost every year of the half-century which followed saw some step made to a wider and truer knowledge of physical fact. Our first national observatory rose at Greenwich, and modern astronomy began with the long

series of observations which immortalized the name of Flamsteed. His successor, Halley, undertook the investigation of the tides, of comets, and of terrestrial magnetism. Hooke improved the microscope, and gave a fresh impulse to microscopical research. Boyle made the air-pump a means of advancing the science of pneumatics, and became the founder of experimental chemistry. Wilkins pointed forward to the science of philology in his scheme of a universal language. Sydenham introduced a careful observation of nature and facts, which changed the whole face of medicine. The physiological researches of Willis first threw light upon the structure of the brain. Woodward was the founder of mineralogy. In his edition of Willoughby's "Ornithology," and in his own "History of Fishes," John Ray was the first to raise zoology to the rank of a science, and the first scientific classification of animals was attempted in his "Synopsis of Quadrupeds." Modern botany began with Ray's "History of Plants," and the researches of an Oxford professor, Robert Morrison; while Grove divided with Malpighi the credit of founding the study of vegetable physiology.

1159. But great as some of these names undoubtedly are, they are lost in the luster of Isaac Newton. Newton was born at Woolsthorpe, in Lincolnshire, on Christmas day, 1642, the memorable year which saw the outbreak of the civil war. In the year of the restoration he entered Cambridge, where the teaching of Isaac Barrow quickened his genius for mathematics, and where the method of Descartes had superseded the older modes of study. From the

close of his Cambridge career his life became a series of great physical discoveries. At twenty-three he facilitated the calculation of planetary movements by his theory of fluxions. The optical discoveries to which he was led by his experiments with the prism, and which he partly disclosed in the lectures which he delivered as mathematical professor at Cambridge, were embodied in the theory of light which he laid before the Royal Society on becoming a fellow of it. His discovery of the law of gravitation had been made as early as 1666; but the erroneous estimate which was then generally received of the earth's diameter prevented him from disclosing it for sixteen years; and it was not till 1687, on the eve of the revolution, that the "Principia" revealed to the world his new theory of the universe.

1160. It is impossible to more than indicate in such a summary as we have given the wonderful activity of directly scientific thought which distinguished the age of the restoration. But the skeptical and experimental temper of mind which this activity disclosed was telling at the same time upon every phase of the world around it. We see the attempt to bring religious speculation into harmony with the conclusions of reason and experience in the school of Latitudinarian theologians which sprang from the group of thinkers that gathered on the eve of the civil war round Lord Falkland at Great Tew. With the restoration the Latitudinarians came at once to the front. They were soon distinguished from both Puritans and high-churchmen by their opposition to dogma, by their prefer-

ence of reason to tradition, whether of the Bible or the church, by their basing religion on a natural theology, by their aiming at rightness of life rather than at correctness of opinion, by their advocacy of toleration and comprehension as the grounds of Christian unity. Chillingworth and Taylor found successors in the restless good sense of Burnet, the enlightened piety of Tillotson, and the calm philosophy of Bishop Butler. From this moment, indeed, the work of English theologians turned from the bold assertion of the supremacy of revealed truth over natural reason to a more cautious assertion of the essential harmony of the one with the other. Boyle varied his philosophical experiments by demonstrations of the unity of dogmatic and natural religion. So moderate and philosophical was the temper displayed by Cudworth in his "Intellectual System of the Universe," that the bigots of his day charged him with the atheistic principles which he was endeavoring to refute. But the change of tone in the theologians of the reformation was itself an indication of the new difficulties which theology had to meet. The bold skepticism of Hobbes was adopted by courtiers and politicians. Charles himself was divided between superstition and Hobbism. Shaftesbury was a deist. The bulk of the leading statesmen of the time looked on religious questions in a purely political light.

1161. The impulse which was carrying religious speculation into regions hitherto strange to it, told equally on political and social inquiry. The researches of Sir Josiah Child, and still more of Sir

William Petty, not only threw light on the actual state of English trade, but pointed forward to the future science of political economy. For the moment, however, philosophical speculation on the nature of government eclipsed the interest of statistical research. Though the restoration brought Hobbes a pension, his two great works were condemned by parliament, and Hobbism became ere he died a popular synonym for political as well as religious immorality. But in spite of the bitter resistance offered to it, his assertion of a rational method of political inquiry superseded more and more the older doctrines of a religious and traditional polity. After Clarendon, no English statesman really believed in any divine right of the sovereign he served; and Charles himself probably believed it still less than his ministers. The fiction of a contract between governor and governed, on which Hobbes built up his theory of a state, passed silently into general acceptance. John Locke, the foremost political thinker of the restoration, derived political authority, like Hobbes, from the consent of the governed, and adopted the common weal as the end of government. But the practical temper of the time molded the new theory into a form which contrasted strangely with that given to it by its first inventor. The political philosophy of Locke, indeed, was little more than a formal statement of the conclusions which the bulk of Englishmen had drawn from the great struggle of the civil war. In his theory the people remain passively in possession of the power which they have delegated

to the prince, and have the right to withdraw it if it be used for purposes inconsistent with the end which society was formed to promote. To the origin of all power in the people, and the end of all power for the people's good—the two great doctrines of Hobbes—Locke added the right of resistance, the responsibility of princes to their subjects for a due execution of their trust, and the supremacy of legislative assemblies as expressing the voice of the people itself.

1162. It was in this modified and enlarged form that the new political philosophy found general acceptance after the revolution of 1688. But, powerful as was its influence in the thirty years which separated that event from the restoration, it remained during that period an influence which told but slowly on the people at large. It is, indeed, this severance for the time between the thinking classes and the general bulk of the nation which makes its history so difficult and perplexing. While skeptics and divines were drifting to questions which involved the very being of religion itself, the mass of Englishmen were still without a doubt, and dead to every religious struggle save the old struggle of Protestantism with the pope. While statesmen and philosophers were smiling at Sir Robert Filmer and his "Patriarchal Theory of Government," the people remained blind to any notion of an original contract, and every pulpit resounded with the doctrine of a divine right of kings. It was only by slow steps, and above all by the practical stress of events, that England was driven forward to religious tolera-

tion or to the establishment of parliamentary government in the place of monarchy.

1163. Slowly and gradually, however, it was driven forward to both. Even at the outset of the restoration the temper of England had, in fact, drifted far from the past to which it thought to return. The work of the Long Parliament, indeed, seemed to be undone when Charles entered Whitehall. Not only was the monarchy restored, but it was restored without restriction or condition; and of the two great influences which had hitherto served as checks on its power, the first, that of Puritanism, had become hateful to the nation at large, while the second, the tradition of constitutional liberty, was discredited by the issue of the civil war. But, wild as was the tumult of demonstrative loyalty, not one of the great steps toward constitutional freedom which had been gained by the patriots of 1641 was really lost. The prerogatives for which Charles the First had struggled were quietly relinquished by his son. The very cavaliers who had welcomed the king to "his own again" never dreamt of restoring the system of government which their opponents had overthrown. Twenty years of parliamentary rule, however broken and mixed with political and religious tyranny, had made the return to ship-money or monopolies or the Star-chamber impossible. Men had become so accustomed to freedom that they forgot how recent a thing its unquestioned existence was. From the first, therefore, the great "revolution of the seventeenth century," as it has been called, went steadily on. The supreme power was gradually transferred

from the crown to the house of commons. Step by step parliament drew nearer to a solution of the political problem which had so long foiled its efforts —the problem how to make its will the law of administrative action without itself undertaking the task of administration. It is only by carefully fixing our eyes on this transfer of power, and by noting the successive steps toward its realization, that we can understand the complex history of the restoration and the revolution.

1164. Changed to the very core, yet hardly conscious of the change, drifting, indeed, steadily toward a wider knowledge and a firmer freedom, but still a mere medley of Puritan morality and social revolt, of traditional loyalty and political skepticism, of bigotry and free inquiry, of science and popish plots, the England of the restoration was reflected in its king. What his subjects saw in Charles the Second was a pleasant, brown-faced gentleman playing with his spaniels, or drawing caricatures of his ministers, or flinging cakes to the water-fowl in the park. To all outer seeming, Charles was the most consummate of idlers. "He delighted," says one of his courtiers, "in a bewitching kind of pleasure called sauntering." The business-like Pepys discovered, as he brought his work to the council board, that "the king do mind nothing but pleasures, and hates the very sight or thoughts of business." That Charles had great natural parts no one doubted. In his earlier days of defeat and danger he showed a cool courage and presence of mind which never failed him in the many perilous mo-

ments of his reign. His temper was pleasant and social, his manners perfect, and there was a careless freedom and courtesy in his address which won over everybody who came into his presence. His education, indeed, had been so grossly neglected that he could hardly read a plain Latin book; but his natural quickness and intelligence showed itself in his pursuit of chemistry and anatomy, and in the interest he showed in the scientific inquiries of the Royal Society. Like Peter the Great his favorite study was that of naval architecture, and he piqued himself on being a clever ship-builder. He had some little love, too, for art and poetry, and a taste for music. But his shrewdness and vivacity showed themselves most in his endless talk. He was fond of telling stories, and he told them with a good deal of grace and humor. He held his own fairly with the wits of his court, and bandied repartees on equal terms with Sedley or Buckingham. Even Rochester, in his merciless epigram, was forced to own that "Charles never said a foolish thing." He had inherited, in fact, his grandfather's gift of pithy sayings, and his habitual irony often gave an amusing turn to them. When his brother, the most unpopular man in England, solemnly warned him of plots against his life, Charles laughingly bade him set all fear aside. "They will never kill me, James," he said, "to make you king."

1165. But courage and wit and ability seem to have been bestowed on Charles in vain. He only laughed when Tom Killigrew told him frankly that, badly as things were going on, there was one man

whose industry could set them right, "and this is one Charles Stuart, who now spends his time in using his lips about the court and hath no other employment." Charles made no secret, in fact, of his hatred of business. Nor did he give to outer observers any signs of ambition. The one thing he seemed in earnest about was sensual pleasure, and he took his pleasure with a cynical shamelessness which roused the disgust even of his shameless courtiers. Mistress followed mistress, and the guilt of a troop of profligate women was blazoned to the world by the gift of titles and estates. The royal bastards were set among English nobles. The ducal house of Grafton springs from the king's adultery with Barbara Palmer, whom he created Duchess of Cleveland. The dukes of St. Albans owe their origin to his intrigues with Nell Gwynn, a player and a courtesan. Louise de Querouaille, a mistress sent by France to win him to its interests, became Duchess of Portsmouth and ancestress of the house of Richmond. An earlier mistress, Lucy Walters, had made him father in younger days of the boy whom he raised to the dukedom of Monmouth, and to whom the dukes of Buccleuch trace their line. But Charles was far from being content with these recognized mistresses or with a single form of self-indulgence. Gambling and drinking helped to fill up the vacant moments when he could no longer toy with his favorites or bet at Newmarket. No thought of remorse or of shame seems ever to have crossed his mind. "He could not think God would make a man miserable," he

said once, "only for taking a little pleasure out of the way." From shame he was shielded by his cynical disbelief in human virtue. Virtue, indeed, he regarded simply as a trick by which clever hypocrites imposed upon fools. Honor among men seemed to him as mere a pretense as chastity among women. Gratitude he had none, for he looked upon self-interest as the only motive of men's actions, and, though soldiers had died and women had risked their lives for him, "he loved others as little as he thought they loved him." But if he felt no gratitude for benefits, he felt no resentment for wrongs. He was incapable either of love or of hate. The only feeling he retained for his fellow-men was that of an amused contempt.

1166. It was difficult for Englishmen to believe that any real danger to liberty could come from an idler and a voluptuary such as Charles the Second. But in the very difficulty of believing this lay half the king's strength. He had, in fact, no taste whatever for the despotism of the Stuarts who had gone before him. His shrewdness laughed his grandfather's theories of divine right down the wind, while his indolence made such a personal administration as that which his father delighted in burdensome to him. He was too humorous a man to care for the pomp and show of power, and too good-natured a man to play the tyrant. But he believed as firmly as his father or his grandfather had believed in his right to a full possession of the older prerogatives of the crown. He looked on parliaments as they had looked on them, with suspicion and jealousy. He

clung as they had clung to the dream of a dispensing power over the execution of the laws. He regarded ecclesiastical affairs as lying within his own personal control, and viewed the interference of the two houses with church matters as a sheer usurpation. Above all he detested the notion of ministerial responsibility to any but the king, or of a parliamentary right to interfere in any way with the actual administration of public affairs. "He told Lord Essex," Burnet says, "that he did not wish to be like a Grand Signior, with some mutes about him, and bags of bowstrings to strangle men; but he did not think he was a king so long as a company of fellows were looking into his actions, and examining his ministers as well as his accounts." "A king," he thought, "who might be checked, and have his ministers called to an account, was but a king in name."

1167. In other words Charles had no settled plan of tyranny, but he meant to rule as independently as he could, and from the beginning to the end of his reign there never was a moment when he was not doing something to carry out his aim. But he carried it out in a tentative, irregular fashion which it was as hard to detect as to meet. Whenever there was any strong opposition he gave way. If popular feeling demanded the dismissal of his ministers, he dismissed them. If it protested against his declaration of religious indulgence, he recalled it. If it cried for victims in the frenzy of the popish plot, he gave it victims till the frenzy was at an end. It was easy for Charles to yield and to wait,

and just as easy for him to take up the thread of his purpose afresh the moment the pressure was over. There was one fixed resolve, in fact, which overrode every other thought in the king's mind, and this was a resolve "not to set out on his travels again." His father had fallen through a quarrel with the two houses, and Charles was determined to remain on good terms with the parliament till he was strong enough to pick a quarrel to his profit. At no time has party strife raged more fiercely; in no reign has the temper of the parliament been more threatening to the crown. But the cynicism of Charles enabled him to ride out storms which would have wrecked a better and a nobler king. He treated the lords with an easy familiarity which robbed opposition of its seriousness. "Their debates amused him," he said in his indolent way; and he stood chatting before the fire while peer after peer poured invectives on his ministers, and laughed louder than the rest when Shaftesbury directed his coarsest taunts at the barrenness of the queen. Courtiers were intrusted with the secret "management" of the commons; obstinate country gentlemen were brought to the royal closet to kiss the king's hand and listen to the king's pleasant stories of his escape after Worcester; and still more obstinate country gentlemen were bribed. Where bribes, flattery, and management failed, Charles was content to yield and to wait till his time came again.

1168. But even while yielding and waiting he never lost sight of the aim he had set himself. If

he had no mind to play the tyrant, he was resolved to be something more than "a king in name." If he could not get back all that his father had had, he could go on patiently gathering up what fragments of the old royal power still survived, and availing himself of whatever new resources offered themselves. One means of recovering somewhat of the older authority of the crown lay in the simple refusal to recognize the union of the three kingdoms. If he could not undo what the Puritans had done in England, Charles could undo their work in Scotland and in Ireland. Before the civil war these kingdoms had served as useful checks on English liberty, and by simply regarding the union which the Long Parliament and the protector had brought about as a nullity in law, it was possible they might become checks again. In his refusal to recognize the union, Charles was supported by public opinion among his English subjects, partly from sheer abhorrence of changes wrought during "the troubles," and partly from a dread that the Scotch and Irish members would form a party in the English parliament which would always be at the service of the crown. In both the lesser kingdoms, too, a measure which seemed to restore somewhat of their national independence was for the moment popular.

1169. But the results of this step were quick in developing themselves. In Scotland the covenant was at once abolished. The Scotch parliament which assembled at Edinburgh, the drunken parliament as it was called, outdid the wildest loyalty of the English cavaliers by annulling in a single act all

he proceedings of its predecessors during the last eight-and-twenty years. By this measure the whole existing church system of Scotland was deprived of legal sanction. The general assembly had already been prohibited from meeting by Cromwell; the kirk-sessions and ministers' synods were now suspended. The Scotch bishops were again restored to their spiritual pre-eminence and to their seats in parliament. An iniquitous trial sent the Marquis of Argyle, the only noble strong enough to oppose the royal will, to the block; and the government was entrusted to a knot of profligate statesmen till it fell into the hands of Lauderdale, one of the ablest and most unscrupulous of the king's ministers. Their policy was steadily directed to two purposes, the first that of humbling Presbyterianism—as the force which could alone restore Scotland to freedom and enable her to lend aid as before to English liberty in any struggle with the crown; the second, that of raising a royal army which might be ready in case of need to march over the border to the king's support. In Ireland, the dissolution of the union brought back the bishops to their sees, but whatever wish Charles may have had to restore the balance of Catholic and Protestant as a source of power to the crown was baffled by the obstinate resistance of the Protestant settlers to any plans for redressing the confiscations of Cromwell Five years of bitter struggle between the dispossessed loyalists and the new occupants left the Protestant ascendency unimpaired; and in spite of a nominal surrender of one third of the confiscated estates to their old posses-

sors, hardly a sixth of the profitable land in the island remained in Catholic holding. The claims of the Duke of Ormond, too, made it necessary to leave the government in his hands, and Ormond's loyalty was too moderate and constitutional to lend itself to any of the schemes of absolute rule which played so great a part in the next reign under Tyrconnell.

1170. But the severance of the two kingdoms from England was in itself a gain to the royal authority; and Charles turned quietly to the building up of a royal army at home. A standing army had become so hateful a thing to the body of the nation, and above all to the royalists whom the new model had trodden under foot, that it was impossible to propose its establishment. But in the mind of both Charles and his brother James, the Duke of York, their father's downfall had been owing to the want of a disciplined force which would have trampled out the first efforts of national resistance; and while disbanding the new model, Charles availed himself of the alarm created by a mad rising of some fifth-monarchy men in London, under an old soldier called Venner, to retain 5000 horse and foot in his service under the name of his guards. A body of "gentlemen of quality and veteran soldiers, excellently clad, mounted, and ordered," was thus kept ready for service near the royal person; and in spite of the scandal which it aroused the king persisted, steadily but cautiously, in gradually increasing its numbers. Twenty years later it had grown to a force of 7000 foot and 1700 horse and dragoons at home, with a reserve of six

fine regiments abroad in the service of the united provinces.

1171. But it was rather on policy than on open force that Charles counted for success. His position, indeed, was a strange and perplexing one. All the outer pomp of the monarchy had returned with the restoration. Charles, like his father, was served by the highest nobles on their knees. Nor had the theory of his position in appearance changed. The principle, indeed, of hereditary kingship had gained a new strength from the troubles of the last twenty years. The fall of the monarchy had been followed so closely by that of the other institutions, political and religious, of the realm, its restoration coincided so exactly with their revival, that the crown had become the symbol of that national tradition, that historical continuity, without which the practical sense of Englishmen felt then, as Burke felt afterward, that men were "but as flies in a summer." How profound a disgust the violent interruption of this continuous progress, by the clean sweep of the civil war, had left behind it was seen in the indifference with which measures such as the union of the three kingdoms or the reform of parliamentary representation were set aside as sharing in the general vice of the time from which they sprang. It was seen as vividly at even a later time in the instant ruin of Shaftesbury's popularity from the moment when he was believed to be plotting the renewal of civil war. But if the monarchy was strengthened by its association with the tradition of constitutional freedom it was henceforth insepara·

bly bound to the freedom which strengthened it. The cavalier who had shouted for the king's return had shouted also for the return of a free parliament. The very chief-justice who asserted at the trial of the regicides the personal freedom of the king from any responsibility to the nation asserted just as strongly that doctrine of ministerial responsibility against which Charles the First had struggled. "The law, in all cases, preserves the person of the king to be authorized," said Sir Orlando Bridgeman, "but what is done by his ministers unlawfully, there is a remedy against his ministers for it." It was the desire of every royalist to blot out the very memory of the troubles in which monarchy and freedom had alike disappeared, to take up again as if it had never been broken the thread of our political history. But the point at which even royalists took it up was not at the moment of the tyranny, but at the moment of the Long Parliament's first triumph when that tyranny had been utterly undone. In his wish to revive those older claims of the crown which the Long Parliament had forever set aside, the young king found himself alone. His closest adherents, his warmest friends, were constitutional royalists of the temper of Falkland or Colepepper: partisans of an absolute monarchy, of such a monarchy as his grandfather had dreamed of and his father for a few years carried into practice, there now were none.

1172. In his political aims, therefore, Charles could look for no help within his realm. Nor did he stand less alone in his religious aims. In heart,

whether the story of his renunciation of Protestantism during his exile be true or no, he had long ceased to be a Protestant. Whatever religious feeling he had was on the side of Catholicism; he encouraged conversions among his courtiers, and the last act of his life was to seek formal admission into the Roman church. But his feelings were rather political than religious. The English Roman Catholics formed a far larger part of the population then than now, and their wealth and local influence gave them a political importance which they have long since lost. The Stuarts had taught them to look to the crown for protection against the Protestant bigotry around them, and they repaid this shelter by aiding Charles the First in his war on the parliament, and by liberally supplying his son with money during his exile. He had promised, in return, to procure toleration for their worship, and every motive of gratitude as well as self-interest led him to redeem his pledge. But he was already looking, however vaguely, to something more than Catholic toleration. He saw that despotism in the state could hardly co-exist with free inquiry and free action in matters of the conscience, and that government, in his own words, "was a safer and easier thing where the authority was believed infallible, and the faith and submission of the people were implicit." The difficulties in the way of such a religious change probably seemed the less to him from his long residence in Roman Catholic countries and from his own religious skepticism. Two years, indeed, after his restoration he had already dispatched an agent to

Rome to arrange the terms of a reconciliation between the Anglican church and the papacy. But, though he counted much for the success of his project of toleration on taking advantage of the dissensions between Protestant churchmen and Protestant dissenters, he soon discovered that in this or any wider religious project he stood utterly alone. Clarendon and the cavaliers were as bitterly anti-Catholic as the wildest fanatic in his realm. For any real success in his religious as in his political aims he must look elsewhere than at home.

1173. Holland had been the first power to offer him its aid in the renewal of the old defensive alliance which had united the two countries before the civil war, and it had accompanied its offer by hints of a heavy subsidy. But offers and hints were alike withdrawn when it was found that the new government persisted in enforcing the navigation act which the Long Parliament had passed. Spain, to which Charles looked with greater hope, demanded terms of alliance which were impossible—the restoration of Jamaica and the cession of Dunkirk. One ally only remained. At this moment France was the dominant power in Christendom. The religious wars which began with the reformation had broken the strength of the nations around her. Spain was no longer able to fight the battle of Catholicism. The peace of Westphalia, by the independence it gave to the German princes and the jealousy it kept alive between the Protestant and Catholic powers of Germany, destroyed the strength of the empire. The German branch of the house of Austria, spent

with the long struggle of the Thirty Years' war, had enough to do in battling hard against the advance of the Turks from Hungary on Vienna. The victories of Gustavus and of the generals whom he formed had been dearly purchased by the exhaustion of Sweden. The united provinces were as yet hardly regarded as a great power, and were trammeled by their contest with England for the empire of the seas.

1174. France alone profited by the general wreck. The wisdom of Henry the Fourth in securing religious peace by a grant of toleration to the Protestants had undone the ill effects of its religious wars. The Huguenots were still numerous south of the Loire, but the loss of their fortresses had turned their energies into the peaceful channels of industry and trade. Feudal disorder was roughly put down by Richelieu; and the policy which gathered all local power into the hands of the crown, though fatal in the end to the real welfare of France, gave it for the moment an air of good government and a command over its internal resources which no other country could boast. Its compact and fertile territory, the natural activity and enterprise of its people, and the rapid growth of its commerce and manufactures, were sources of natural wealth which even its heavy taxation failed to check. In the latter half of the seventeenth century France was looked upon as the wealthiest power in Europe. The yearly income of the French crown was double that of England, and even Louis the Fourteenth trusted as much to the credit of his treasury as to the triumphs of his

arms. "After all," he said, when the fortunes of war began to turn against him, "it is the last louis d'or which must win!"

1175. It was, in fact, this superiority in wealth which enabled France to set on foot forces such as had never been seen in Europe since the downfall of Rome. At the opening of the reign of Louis the Fourteenth its army mustered 100,000 men. With the war against Holland it rose to nearly 200,000. In the last struggle against the grand alliance there was a time when it counted nearly half a million of men in arms. Nor was France content with these enormous land forces. Since the ruin of Spain the fleets of Holland and of England had alone disputed the empire of the seas. Under Richelieu and Mazarin France could hardly be looked upon as a naval power. But the early years of Louis saw the creation of a navy of a hundred men-of-war, and the fleets of France soon held their own against England or the Dutch.

1176. Such a power would have been formidable at any time, but it was doubly formidable when directed by statesmen who, in knowledge and ability, were without rivals in Europe. No diplomatist could compare with Lionne, no war minister with Louvois, no financier with Colbert. Their young master, Louis the Fourteenth, bigoted, narrow-minded, commonplace as he was, without personal honor or personal courage, without gratitude and without pity, insane in his pride, insatiable in his vanity, brutal in his selfishness, had still many of the qualities of a great ruler—industry, patience, quick

ness of resolve, firmness of purpose, a capacity for discerning ability and using it, an immense self-belief and self-confidence, and a temper utterly destitute indeed of real greatness, but with a dramatic turn for seeming to be great. As a politician Louis had simply to reap the harvest which the two great cardinals who went before him had sown. Both had used to the profit of France the exhaustion and dissension which the wars of religion had brought upon Europe. Richelieu turned the scale against the house of Austria by his alliance with Sweden, with the united provinces, and with the Protestant princes of Germany; and the two great treaties by which Mazarin ended the Thirty Years' war, the treaty of Westphalia and the treaty of the Pyrenees, left the empire disorganized and Spain powerless. From that moment, indeed, Spain sank into a strange decrepitude. Robbed of the chief source of her wealth by the independence of Holland, weakened at home by the revolt of Portugal, her infantry annihilated by Condé in his victory of Rocroi, her fleet ruined by the Dutch, her best blood drained away to the Indies, the energies of her people destroyed by the suppression of all liberty, civil or religious, her intellectual life crushed by the Inquisition, her industry crippled by the expulsion of the Moors, by financial oppression, and by the folly of her colonial system, the kingdom which under Philip the Second had aimed at the empire of the world lay helpless and exhausted under Philip the Fourth.

1177. The aim of Louis was to carry on the policy of his predecessors, and above all to complete the

ruin of Spain. The conquest of the Spanish provinces in the Netherlands would carry his border to the Scheldt. A more distant hope lay in the probable extinction of the Austrian line which now sat on the throne of Spain. By securing the succession to that throne for a French prince, not only Castile and Aragon with the Spanish dependencies in Italy and the Netherlands, but the Spanish empire in the New World would be added to the dominions of France. Nothing could save Spain but a union of the European powers, and to prevent this union was the work to which the French negotiators were now bending their energies with singular success. The intervention of the emperor was guarded against by a renewal of the old alliances between France and the lesser German princes. A league with the Turks gave the court of Vienna enough to do on its eastern border. The old league with Sweden, the old friendship with Holland, were skillfully maintained. England alone remained as a possible foe, and at this moment the policy of Charles bound England to the side of Louis.

1178. France was the wealthiest of European powers, and her subsidies could free Charles from his dependence on the parliament. The French army was the finest in the world, and French soldiers could put down, it was thought, any resistance from English patriots. The aid of Louis could alone realize the aims of Charles, and Charles was willing to pay the price, that of a silent concurrence in his Spanish projects, which Louis demanded for his aid. It was to France, therefore, in spite of the resent-

ment he felt at his treatment by her in his time of exile, that Charles turned in the earliest days of his reign. There was no trace as yet of any formal alliance, but two marriages showed the close connection which was to be established between the kings. Henrietta, the sister of Charles, was wedded to the Duke of Orleans, the brother of Louis: and this match served as the prelude to that of Charles himself with Catharine of Braganza, a daughter of the King of Portugal. The English ministers were dazzled by the dowry which the new queen brought with her half a million in money, the fortress of Tangier in the Mediterranean, the trading port of Bombay in the Indies, and a pledge of religious toleration for all English merchants throughout the Portuguese colonies. The world at large saw rather the political significance of the marriage. As the conquest of Portugal by Philip the Second had crowned the greatness of the Spanish monarchy, so with its revolt had begun the fall of Spain. To recover Portugal was the dream of every Spaniard, as to aid Portugal in the preservation of its independence was the steady policy of France. The Portuguese marriage, the Portuguese alliance which followed it, ranged England definitely among the friends of Louis and the foes of Spain.

1179. In England itself these indications of the king's foreign policy passed as yet almost without notice. The attention of the nation was naturally concentrated on the work of political and social restoration. What shape the New England would take, what was to be its political or religious form,

was still uncertain. It was still doubtful which political or religious party had really the upper hand. The show of power lay as yet with the Presbyterians. It was by the Presbyterians that the chief part in the restoration had, in fact, been played; and it was the Presbyterians who still almost exclusively possessed the magistracy and all local authority. The first ministry which Charles ventured to form bore on it the marks of a compromise between this powerful party and their old opponents. Its most influential member, indeed, was Sir Edward Hyde, the adviser of the king during his exile, who soon became Earl of Clarendon and lord chancellor. Lord Southampton, a steady royalist, accepted the post of lord treasurer; and the devotion of Ormond was rewarded with a dukedom and the dignity of lord steward. But the Presbyterian interest was represented by Monk, who remained lord-general of the army with the title of Duke of Albemarle; and though the king's brother, James Duke of York, was made lord admiral, the administration of the fleet was virtually in the hands of one of Cromwell's followers, Montagu, the new Earl of Sandwich. An old Puritan, Lord Say and Sele, was made lord privy seal. Sir Ashley Cooper, a leading member of the same party, was rewarded for his activity in bringing about the restoration by a barony and the office of chancellor of the exchequer. Of the two secretaries of state, the one, Nicholas, was a devoted royalist; the other, Morice, was a steady Presbyterian. Of the thirty members of the privy council, twelve had borne arms against the king.

1180. It was clear that such a ministry was hardly likely to lend itself to a mere policy of reaction, and the temper of the new government, therefore, fell fairly in with the temper of the convention when that body, after declaring itself a parliament, proceeded to consider the measures which were requisite for a settlement of the nation. The convention had been chosen under ordinances which excluded royalist "malignants" from the right of voting; and the bulk of its members were men of Presbyterian sympathies, loyalist to the core, but as adverse to despotism as the Long Parliament itself. In its earlier days a member who asserted that those who had fought against the king were as guilty as those who cut off his head was sternly rebuked from the chair. The first measure which was undertaken by the house, the bill of indemnity and oblivion for all offenses committed during the recent troubles, showed at once the moderate character of the commons. In the punishment of the regicides, indeed, a Presbyterian might well be as zealous as a cavalier. In spite of a proclamation issued in the first days of his return, which virtually promised mercy to all the judges of the late king who surrendered themselves to justice, Charles pressed for revenge on those whom he regarded as his father's murderers, and the lords went hotly with the king. It is to the credit of the commons that they steadily resisted the cry for blood. By the original provisions of the bill of oblivion and indemnity, only seven of the living regicides were excluded from pardon; and though the rise of royalist fervor during the three months in

which the bill was under discussion forced the house in the end to leave almost all to the course of justice, yet a clause which made a special act of parliament necessary for the execution of those who had surrendered under the proclamation protected the lives of most of them. Twenty-eight of the king's judges were, in the end, arraigned at the bar of a court specially convened for their trial, but only thirteen were executed, and only one of these, General Harrison, had played any conspicuous part in the rebellion. Twenty others, who had been prominent in what were now called "the troubles" of the past twenty years, were declared incapable of holding office under the state; and by an unjustifiable clause which was introduced into the act before its final adoption, Sir Harry Vane and General Lambert, though they had taken no part in the king's death, were specially exempted from the general pardon.

1181. In dealing with the questions of property which arose from the confiscations and transfers of estates during the civil wars, the convention met with greater difficulties. No opposition was made to the resumption of all crown lands by the state, but the convention desired to protect the rights of those who had purchased church property and of those who were in actual possession of private estates which had been confiscated by the Long Parliament or by the government which succeeded it. The bills, however, which they prepared for this purpose were delayed by the artifices of Hyde; and at the close of the session the bishops and the evicted royalists quietly re-entered into the occupation

of their old possessions. The royalists, indeed, were far from being satisfied with this summary confiscation. Fines and sequestrations had impoverished all the steady adherents of the royal cause, and had driven many of them to forced sales of their estates; and a demand was made for compensation for their losses and the canceling of these sales. Without such provisions, said the frenzied cavaliers, the bill would be "a bill of indemnity for the king's enemies and of oblivion for his friends." But here the convention stood firm. All transfers of property by sale were recognized as valid, and all claims of compensation for losses by sequestration were barred by the act.

1182. From the settlement of the nation the convention passed to the settlement of the relations between the nation and the crown. So far was the constitutional work of the Long Parliament from being undone that its more important measures were silently accepted as the base of future government. Not a voice demanded the restoration of the star-chamber, or of monopolies, or of the court of high commission; no one disputed the justice of the condemnation of ship-money or the assertion of the sole right of parliament to grant supplies to the crown. The militia, indeed, was placed in the king's hands; but the army was disbanded, though Charles was permitted to keep a few regiments for his guard. The revenue was fixed at £1,200,000, and this sum was granted to the king for life, a grant which might have been perilous for freedom had not the taxes voted to supply the sum fallen constantly below this

estimate, while the current expenses of the crown, even in time of peace, greatly exceeded it. But even for this grant a heavy price was exacted. Though the rights of the crown over lands held, as the bulk of English estates were held, in military tenure had ceased to be of any great pecuniary value, they were indirectly a source of considerable power. The rights of wardship and of marriage, above all, enabled the sovereign to exercise a galling pressure on every landed proprietor in his social and domestic concerns. Under Elizabeth the right of wardship had been used to secure the education of all Catholic minors in the Protestant faith; and under James and his successor the charge of minors had been granted to court favorites or sold in open market to the highest bidder. But the real value of these rights to the crown lay in the political pressure which it was able to exert through them on the country gentry. A squire was naturally eager to buy the good will of a sovereign who might soon be the guardian of his daughter and the administrator of his estate. But the same motives which made the crown cling to this prerogative made the parliament anxious to do away with it. Its efforts to bring this about under James the First had been foiled by the king's stubborn resistance; but the long interruption of these rights during the troubles made their revival almost impossible at the restoration. One of the first acts, therefore, of the convention, was to free the country gentry by abolishing the claims of the crown to reliefs and wardship, purveyance, and pre-emption, and by the conversion of lands held till then in

chivalry into lands held in common socage. In lieu of his rights Charles accepted a grant of £100,000 a year· a sum which it was originally purposed to raise by a tax on the lands thus exempted from feudal exactions, but which was provided for in the end with less justice by a general excise.

1183. Successful as the convention had been in effecting a settlement of political matters, it failed in bringing about a settlement of the church. In his proclamation from Breda, Charles had promised to respect liberty of conscience, and to assent to any acts of parliament which should be presented to him for its security. The convention was, in the main, Presbyterian; but it soon became plain that the continuance of a purely Presbyterian system was impossible. "The generality of the people," wrote Sharpe, a shrewd Scotch observer, from London, "are doting after prelacy and the service-book." The convention, however, still hoped for some modified form of Episcopalian government which would enable the bulk of the Puritan party to remain within the church. A large part of the existing clergy, indeed, were independents, and for these no compromise with Episcopacy was possible: but the greater number were moderate Presbyterians who were ready, "for fear of worse," not only to submit to such a plan of church government as Archbishop Usher had proposed—a plan in which the bishop was only the president of a diocesan board of presbyters —but to accept the liturgy itself with a few amendments and the omission of "superstitious practices." It was to a compromise of this kind that the king

himself leant at the beginning, and a royal declaration announced his approval of the Puritan demands, limited the authority of the bishops by the counsel of their presbyters, and promised a revision of the book of common prayer. The royal declaration was read at a conference of the two parties, and with it a petition from the independents praying for religious liberty. The king proposed to grant the prayer of the petition, not for the independents only, but for all Christians. Dexterous as the move was, it at once spread alarm. The silence of the bishops, the protest of Baxter, proved that on the point of tolerating the Catholics all were at one. In itself, however, the declaration satisfied the Puritan party, and one of their leaders, Dr. Reynolds, accepted a bishopric on the strength of it. But the king's disappointment at the check given to his plans showed itself in the new attitude of the government when a bill was introduced into the house of commons by Sir Matthew Hale to turn the declaration into a law. The opposition of the Episcopalian party was secretly encouraged by the royalist section of the ministry, and the bill thrown out by a small majority. A fresh conference was promised, but in the absence of any parliamentary action the Episcopal party boldly availed themselves of their legal rights. The ejected clergy who still remained alive entered again into their parsonages, the bishops returned to their sees, and the dissolution of the convention-parliament destroyed the last hope of an ecclesiastical compromise.

1184. The tide of loyalty had, in fact, been rising

fast during its session, and its influence was already seen in a shameful outrage wrought under the very orders of the convention itself. The bodies of Cromwell, Bradshaw, and Ireton were torn from their graves and hung on gibbets at Tyburn, while those of Pym and Blake were cast out of Westminster Abbey into St. Margaret's churchyard. But it was only on the dissolution of the convention-parliament, at the end of 1660, that the new political temper made itself vigorously felt. For the first time during twenty years half England found itself able to go to the poll. From the outset of the war, all who had taken part on the royalist side had been disfranchised as "malignants," and this disfranchisement had been rigorously enforced even in the elections to the convention. But "malignity" had now ceased to be a crime, and the voters so long deprived of all share in the suffrage, vicars, country gentlemen, farmers, with the whole body of the Catholics, rushed again to the poll. Their temper, as might be expected, was one of vengeance on the men who had held them down so long. In counties and towns alike, the zeal for church and king, the two causes for which the voters had suffered, swept all hope of moderation or compromise before it. The ruling impulse was to get utterly rid of the old representatives. The Presbyterians, dominant in the convention, sank in the cavalier parliament, as that of 1661 was called, to a handful of fifty members.

1185. The new house of commons was made up, for the most part, of young men, of men, that is, who had but a faint memory of the Stuart tyranny

under which their childhood had been spent, but who had a keen memory of living from manhood beneath the tyranny of the commonwealth. They had seen their fathers driven from the justice-bench, driven from the polling-booth, half-beggared, and imprisoned for no other cause but their loyalty to the king. They had seen the family oaks felled and the family plate sent to the melting-pot to redeem their estates from the pitiless hands of the committee at Goldsmith's Hall. They had themselves been brought like poachers before the justices for a horse-race or a cock-fight. At every breath of a rising a squad of the new model had quartered itself in the manor-house, and a warrant from the major-general of the district had cleared the stables. Nor was this all. The same tyranny which pressed on their social and political life had pressed on their religious life too. The solemn petitions of the book of common prayer, the words which had rung like sweet chimes in their ears from their first childhood, had been banned from every village church as accursed things. It had been only by stealth and at home that the cross could be signed on the brow of the babe whom the squire brought to be christened. Hardly by stealth had it been possible to bury their dead with the words of pathetic hope which have so often brought comfort to the ears of mourners.

1186. And now the young squires felt that their time had come. The Puritan, the Presbyterian, the Commonwealthsman, all were at their feet. Their very bearing was that of wild revolt against the Puritan past. To a staid observer, Roger Pepys

they seemed a following of "the most profane, swearing fellows that ever I heard in my life." Their whole policy appeared to be dictated by a passionate spirit of reaction. They would drive the Presbyterians from the bench and the polling-booth as the Presbyterians had driven them. They would make belief in a commonwealth as much a sign of "malignity" as their enemies had made belief in a king. They would have no military rule: they hated, indeed, the very name of a standing army. They were hot royalists and they were hot churchmen. The old tyranny of the bishops was forgotten, the old jealousy of the clergy set aside, in the memory of a common suffering. The oppressors of the parson had been the oppressors of the squire. The sequestrator who had driven the one from his parsonage had driven the other from his manor-house. Both had been branded with the same charge of malignity. Both had been robbed alike of the same privileges of citizenship. Both had suffered together, and the new parliament was resolved that both should triumph together. For the first time since the reformation the English gentry were ardent, not for king only, but for church and king.

1187. The zeal of the parliament at its outset, therefore, far outran that of Charles or his ministers. Though it confirmed the other acts of its predecessor, the convention, it could with difficulty be brought to confirm the act of indemnity. The commons pressed for the prosecution of Vane. Vane was protected alike by the spirit of the law and by the king's pledge to the convention that, even if con-

victed of treason, he would not suffer him to be sent to the block. But he was now brought to trial on the charge of treason against a king "kept out of his royal authority by traitors and rebels," and his spirited defense served as an excuse for his execution. "He is too dangerous a man to let live," Charles wrote with characteristic coolness, "if we can safely put him out of the way." But the new members were yet better churchmen than loyalists. At the opening of their session they ordered every member to receive the communion, and the league and covenant to be solemnly burnt by the common hangman in Westminster Hall. The bill which excluded the bishops from their seats in the house of lords was repealed. The conference at the Savoy between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians broke up in anger, and the few alterations made in the liturgy were made with a view to disgust rather than to conciliate the Puritan party.

1188. In spite of these outbursts, however, it would be unjust to look on the temper of the new parliament as a mere temper of revenge. Its wish was, in the main, to restore the constitutional system which the civil war had violently interrupted. The royalist party, as we have seen, had no sort of sympathy with the policy of the early Stuarts. Their notions and their aims were not those of Laud and Strafford, but of the group of constitutional loyalists who had followed Falkland in his break with the Long Parliament in 1642. And of that group, by a singular fortune, the most active and conspicuous member now filled the chief place in the counsels of

the king. Edward Hyde had joined Charles the First before the outbreak of the war, he had become his chancellor of the exchequer, and it was to his pen that the bulk of the royal manifestoes were attributed. He had passed with the young Prince of Wales into exile, and had remained the counselor of Charles the Second during the long years which preceded his return. His faithfulness had been amply rewarded. He was now Earl of Clarendon and lord chancellor, and his influence in the royal council, which had been great from the first, became supreme when the temper of the new parliament shattered the hopes of his Presbyterian opponents there. But his aim was simply to carry out the policy he had clung to with Falkland. He was a lawyer by breeding, and his theory of the state was a lawyer's theory. He looked on the English constitution, not as the sum of political forces which were still in process of development, but as a mass of fixed and co-ordinated institutions whose form and mutual relations had been settled in some distant past. He had opposed the Stuart tyranny because—as he held—it had broken down this constitution to the profit of the crown. He worked with the men of the Long Parliament in what he regarded as the work of restoring it; he left them the moment that he fancied they were themselves about to break it down to the profit of the people. Years of exile had only hardened his ideas. He came back with the fixed resolve to hold the state together at the exact point where the first reforms of the Long Parliament had left it. The power and prerogative of the crown, the authority of the church,

were to be jealously preserved, but they were to be preserved by the free will and conviction of the parliament. It was on this harmonious co-operation of these three great institutions that Clarendon's system hung. Its importance to future times lay in his regarding parliament and the church, not as mere accidents or checks in the system of English government, but as essential parts of it, parts which were as needful for its healthy working as the crown itself, and through which the power of the crown was to be exercised. Wholly to realize such a conception it was necessary that the parliament should be politically, the church religiously, representatives of the whole nation.

1189. The first of Clarendon's assumptions was not only a fact but a far greater fact than he imagined. Hence it came about that his assembly of the parliament year after year, and the steady way in which he used it to do the crown's work by setting its stamp on every great political measure, became of the highest importance in our constitutional development. The second was a fiction, for half England had passed from the grasp of the church, but it was to make it a fact that Clarendon buckled himself to a desperate struggle with non-conformity. It was under his guidance that the parliament turned to the carrying out of that principle of uniformity in church as well as in state on which the minister was resolved. The chief obstacle to such a policy lay in the Presbyterians, and the strongholds of the Presbyterians were the corporations of the boroughs. In many of the boroughs the corporation actually returned

the borough members—in all they exercised a powerful influence on their election. To drive the Presbyterians, therefore, from municipal posts was to weaken if not to destroy the Presbyterian party in the house of commons. It was with a view of bringing about this object that the Cavalier Parliament passed a severe corporation act, which required as a condition of entering on any municipal office a reception of the communion according to the rites of the Anglican Church, a renunciation of the league and covenant, and a declaration that it was unlawful on any grounds to take up arms against the king. The attempt was only partially successful, and test and oath were taken after awhile by men who regarded both simply as insults to their religious and political convictions. But if Clarendon was foiled in his effort to secure political uniformity by excluding the Presbyterian party from any connection with the government of the state, he seemed for the time more successful in his attempt to secure a religious uniformity by their exclusion from the church.

1190. An effectual blow was dealt at the Puritans in 1662 by the renewal of the act of uniformity. Not only was the use of the prayer-book and the prayer-book only enforced in all public worship, but an unfeigned consent and assent was demanded from every minister of the church to all which was contained in it; while for the first time since the reformation all orders save those conferred by the hands of bishops were legally disallowed. To give a political stamp to the new measure, the declaration exacted from corporations, that it was unlawful in any case to take

up arms against the crown, was exacted from the clergy, and a pledge was required that they would seek to make no change in church or state. It was in vain that Ashley opposed the bill fiercely in the lords, that the peers pleaded for pensions to the ejected ministers and for the exemption of schoolmasters from the necessity of subscription, and that even Clarendon, who felt that the king's word was at stake, pressed for the insertion of clauses enabling the crown to grant dispensations from its provisions. Every suggestion of compromise was rejected by the commons; and Charles, whose aim was to procure a toleration for the Catholics by allowing the Presbyterians to feel the pressure of persecution, at last assented to the bill.

1191. The bill passed in May, but its execution was deferred till August; and in the interval the Presbyterian party in the royal council struggled hard to obtain from the king a suspension of its provisions by the exercise of his prerogative. Charles had promised this, but the bishops were resolute to enforce the law; and on St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24th, the last day allowed for compliance with its requirements, nearly 2000 rectors and vicars or about a fifth of the English clergy, were driven from their parishes as non-conformists. No such sweeping alteration in the religious aspect of the church had ever been seen before. The ecclesiastical changes of the reformation had been brought about with little change in the clergy itself. Even the severities of the high commission under Elizabeth ended in the expulsion of a few hundreds. If Laud had

gone zealously to work in emptying Puritan pulpits, his zeal had been to a great extent foiled by the restrictions of the law and by the growth of Puritan sentiment in the clergy as a whole. A far wider change had been brought about in the expulsion of royalist clergy from their benefices during the civil war; but the change had been gradual, and had been at least ostensibly wrought for the most part on political or moral rather than on religious grounds. The parsons expelled were expelled as "malignants," or as unfitted for their office by idleness or vice or inability to preach. But the change wrought by St. Bartholomew's Day was a distinctly religious change, and it was a change which in its suddenness and completeness stood utterly alone. The rectors and vicars who were driven out were the most learned and the most active of their order. The bulk of the great livings throughout the country were in their hands. They stood at the head of the London clergy, as the London clergy stood in general repute at the head of their class throughout England. They occupied the higher posts at the two universities. No English divine save Jeremy Taylor rivaled Howe as a preacher. No parson was so renowned as a controversialist or so indefatigable a parish priest as Baxter. And behind these men stood a fifth of the whole body of the clergy, men whose zeal and labor had diffused throughout the country a greater appearance of piety and religion than it had ever displayed before.

1192. But the expulsion of these men was far more to the Church of England than the loss of their indi-

vidual services. It was the definite expulsion of a great party which from the time of the reformation had played the most active and popular part in the life of the church. It was the close of an effort which had been going on ever since Elizabeth's accession to bring the English communion into closer relations with the reformed communions of the continent and into greater harmony with the religious instincts of the nation at large. The Church of England stood from that moment isolated and alone among all the churches of the Christian world. The reformation had severed it irretrievably from those which still clung to the obedience of the papacy. By its rejection of all but episcopal orders the act of uniformity severed it as irretrievably from the general body of the Protestant churches, whether Lutheran or reformed. And while thus cut off from all healthy religious communion with the world without, it sank into immobility within. With the expulsion of the Puritan clergy all change, all efforts after reform, all national development, suddenly stopped. From that time to this the Episcopal Church has been unable to meet the varying spiritual needs of its adherents by any modifications of its government or its worship. It stands alone among all the religious bodies of western Christendom in its failure through 200 years to devise a single new service of prayer or of praise.

1193. But if the issues of St. Bartholomew's Day have been harmful to the spiritual life of the English Church, they have been in the highest degree advantageous to the cause of religious liberty. At the res-

toration, religious freedom seemed again to have been lost. Only the independents and a few despised sects, such as the Quakers, upheld the right of every man to worship God according to the bidding of his own conscience. The bulk of the Puritan party, with the Presbyterians at its head, was at one with its opponents in desiring a uniformity of worship, if not of belief, throughout the land. Had the two great parties within the church held together, their weight would have been almost irresistible. Fortunately the great severance of St. Bartholomew's Day drove out the Presbyterians from the church to which they clung, and forced them into a general union with sects which they had hated till then almost as bitterly as the bishops themselves. A common persecution soon blended the non-conformists into one. Persecution broke down before the numbers, the wealth, and the political weight of the new sectarians; and the church for the first time in its history found itself confronted with an organized body of dissenters without its pale. The impossibility of crushing such a body as this wrested from English statesmen the first legal recognition of freedom of worship in the toleration act; their rapid growth in later times has by degrees stripped the church of almost all the exclusive privileges which it enjoyed as a religious body, and now threatens what remains of its official connection with the state. With these remoter consequences, however, we are not as yet concerned. It is enough to note here that with the act of uniformity and the expulsion of the Puritan clergy a new element in our religious and political history, the ele-

ment of dissent, the influence of the non-conformist churches, comes first into play.

1194. The sudden outbreak and violence of the persecution, the breaking up of conventicles, the imprisonment of those who were found worshiping in them, turned the disappointment of the Presbyterians into despair. Many were for retiring to Holland, others proposed a general flight to New England and the American colonies. Among the Baptists and independents there was vague talk of an appeal to arms. So threatening, indeed, did the attitude of the sectaries become, that Clarendon was anxious to provide himself with men and money, and above all with foreign aid, for such a struggle, should it come. Different indeed as were the aims of the king and his chancellor, the course of events drew them inevitably together. If Charles desired the friendship of France as a support in any possible struggle with the parliament, Clarendon desired it as a support in the possible struggle with the non-conformists. The first step in this French policy had been the marriage with Catharine of Braganza; the second was the surrender of Dunkirk. The maintenance of the garrison at Dunkirk was a heavy drag upon the royal treasury, and a proposal for its sale to Spain, which was made by Lord Sandwich in council, was seized by Charles and Clarendon as a means of opening a bargain with France. To France the profit was immense. Not only was a port gained in the channel which served during the next hundred years as a haunt for privateers in every war between the two powers, but the withdrawal of the English garrison at the close of

1662 from a port which necessarily drew England into every contest between France and Spain, freed the hands of Louis for the stroke he was patiently planning against the Low Countries. Louis, however, proved a shrewd bargainer, and not a half of the sum originally demanded as its price found its way into the royal treasury, But the money was accepted as a pledge of the close connection which was to bind the two crowns together. Charles declared the cession to be "one of the greatest proofs he could give of his friendship for the French king," and the Duke of York pressed the bargain with assurances that his strongest desire, like that of his brother, was "to unite our interests with those of France." Clarendon was as desirous of such a union as his master. In his eyes the friendship of France, the money, the force placed in his hands by the return of the garrison of Dunkirk to England, were so many safeguards against the outbreak of rebellion which his policy had provoked.

1195. But he had reckoned without Charles, and the time was come when the king was to show how widely his temper and aim differed from those of his chancellor. Charles had no taste for civil war, nor had he the slightest wish to risk his throne in securing the supremacy of the church. His aim was to use the strife between the two great bodies of Protestant religionists so as to secure toleration for the Catholics, and revive at the same time his prerogative of dispensing with the execution of laws. At the close of 1662, therefore, he suddenly broke from the policy of Clarendon, and laid his plans for toleration before

the Presbyterian party who were struggling against the chancellor in the royal council. Of that party, Ashley Cooper, Lord Ashley, was now in influence, though not in rank, the chief. Every step in his career had brought out the boldness, the self-reliance, the versatility and readiness of resource which distinguished his character. In mere boyhood he had saved his estate from the greed of his guardians by boldly appealing in person for protection to Noy, who was then attorney-general. As an undergraduate at Oxford he organized a rebellion of the freshmen against the oppressive customs which were enforced by the senior men of his college, and succeeded in abolishing them. At eighteen he was a member of the Short Parliament. On the outbreak of the civil war he took part with the king; but in the midst of the royal successes he foresaw the ruin of the royal cause, passed to the parliament, attached himself to the fortunes of Cromwell, and became member of the council of state. A temporary disgrace during the last years of the protectorate only quickened him to a restless hatred which did much to bring about its fall. His bitter invectives against the dead protector, his intrigues with Monk, and the active part which he took in the king's recall, were rewarded at the restoration with a peerage and with promotion to a foremost share in the royal councils.

1196. Ashley was then a man of forty, and under the commonwealth he had been famous in Dryden's contemptuous phrase as "the loudest bagpipe of the squeaking train;" but he was no sooner a minister of Charles than he flung himself into the debauchery

of the court with an ardor which surprised even his master. "You are the wickedest dog in England!" laughed the king at some unscrupulous jest of his counselor's. "Of a subject, sir, I believe I am!" was the unabashed reply. But the debauchery of Ashley was simply a mask. He was in fact temperate by nature and habit, and his ill-health rendered any great excess impossible. Men soon found that the courtier who lounged in Lady Castlemaine's boudoir, or drank and jested with Sedley and Buckingham, was a diligent and able man of business. "He is a man," says the puzzled Pepys, three years after the restoration, "of great business and yet of pleasure and dissipation too." His rivals were as envious of the ease and mastery with which he dealt with questions of finance as of the "nimble wit" which won the favor of the king. Even in later years his industry earned the grudging praise of his enemies. Dryden owned that as chancellor he was "swift to dispatch and easy of access," and wondered at the fevered activity which "refused his age the needful hours of rest." His activity indeed was the more wonderful that his health was utterly broken. An accident in early days left behind it an abiding weakness whose traces were seen in the furrows which seamed his long pale face, in the feebleness of his health, and the nervous tremor which shook his puny frame. The "pigmy body" was "fretted to decay" by the "fiery soul" within it. But pain and weakness brought with them no sourness of spirit. Ashley was attacked more unscrupulously than any statesman save Walpole; but Burnet, who

did not love him, owns that he was never bitter or angry in speaking of his assailants. Even the wit with which he crushed them was commonly good humored. "When will you have done preaching?" a bishop murmured testily, as he was speaking in the house of peers. "When I am a bishop, my lord!" was the laughing reply.

1197. As a statesman Ashley not only stood high among his contemporaries from his wonderful readiness and industry, but he stood far above them in his scorn of personal profit. Even Dryden, while raking together every fault in his character, owns that his hands were clean. As a political leader his position was to modern eyes odd enough. In religion he was at most a deist, with some fanciful notions "that after death our souls lived in stars," and his life was that of a debauchee. But deist and debauchee as he was, he remained the representative of the Presbyterian and non-conformist party in the royal council. He was the steady and vehement advocate of toleration, but his advocacy was based on purely political grounds. He saw that persecution would fail to bring back the dissenters to the church, and that the effort to recall them only left the country disunited. He saw too that such a disunion exposed English liberty to invasion from the crown, while it robbed England herself of all influence in Europe at a time when her influence alone could effectually check the ambition of France. The one means of uniting churchmen and dissidents was by a policy of toleration, but in the temper of England after the restoration he saw no hope of obtaining

toleration save from the king. Wit, debauchery, rapidity in the dispatch of business, were all therefore used as a means to gain influence over the king, and to secure him as a friend in the struggle which Ashley carried on against the intolerance of Clarendon.

1198. Charles, as we have seen, had his own game to play, and his own reasons for protecting Ashley during his vehement struggle against the test and corporation act, the act of uniformity, and the persecution of the dissidents. But the struggle had been fruitless, and the only chance—as it seemed to Ashley—of securing toleration was to receive it on the king's own terms. It was with the assent therefore of the Presbyterian party in the council that Charles issued in December a royal proclamation which expressed the king's resolve to exempt from the penalties of the acts which had been passed "those who living peaceably do not conform themselves thereunto through scruple and tenderness of misguided conscience, but modestly and without scandal perform their devotions in their own way." The desire for toleration had in fact not only overcome their dread of Catholicism, but even blinded them to the political dangers of a revival of the dispensing power. The indulgence applied equally to Catholics as to Protestants; it was in itself a bold assertion of the royal prerogative of suspending the execution of the law. The Presbyterian statesmen indeed aimed at giving the dispensing power a legal basis. A bill introduced by Lords Ashley and Roberts in the opening of 1663, in redemption of a pledge

contained in the declaration itself, gave Charles the power to dispense not only with the provisions of the act of uniformity, but with the penalties provided by all laws which enforced religious conformity or which imposed religious tests. But the policy of Charles as of Ashley broke instantly down before the good sense as well as the religious passion of the people at large. If the Presbyterian leaders in the council had stooped to accept the aid of the declaration, the bulk of the dissidents had no mind to have their grievances used as a means of procuring, by a side wind, toleration for Roman Catholics, or of building up again that dispensing power which the civil wars had thrown down. The churchmen, on the other hand, with the bishops at their head, were resolute in opposition. Ever since the issue of the declaration of indulgence the hatred felt by the churchmen for the dissidents had been imbittered by suspicions of a secret league between the dissidents and the Catholics in which the king was taking part. The houses therefore struck simultaneously at both their opponents. They forced Charles by an address to withdraw his pledge of toleration. They then extorted from him a proclamation for the banishment of all Catholic priests, and followed this up by a conventicle act, which punished with fine, imprisonment, and transportation on a third offense all persons who met in greater number than five for any religious worship save that of the common prayer.

1199. What added to the sting of this defeat was the open opposition which Clarendon had offered to his master's scheme in parliament. From that mo-

ment Charles resolved on his minister's ruin. But Clarendon's position was too strong to be easily shaken. Hated by the Catholics and the dissenters, opposed in the council itself by Ashley and the Presbyterian leaders, opposed in the court by the king's mistress, Lady Castlemaine, as well as by the supple and adroit Henry Bennet, a creature of the king's, who began to play a foremost part in politics, Clarendon was still strong in his long and intimate connection with the king's affairs, his alliance with the royal house through the marriage of his daughter, Anne Hyde, with the Duke of York, in his untiring industry, his wide capacity for business, above all in the support of the church and the confidence of the royalist and orthodox house of commons. To the commons and the church he was only bound the closer by the hatred of Catholics and non-conformists or by the futile attempts at impeachment which were made by the Catholic Earl of Bristol in the summer of 1663. The "declaration" indeed had strengthened Clarendon's position. It had identified his policy of persecution with the maintenance of constitutional liberty, and had thrown on Ashley and his opponents the odium of an attempt to set up again the dispensing power and of betraying, as it was thought, the interests of Protestantism into the hands of Rome. Never in fact had Clarendon's power seemed stronger than in 1664; and the only result of the attempt to shake his system of intolerance was an increase of persecution. Of the sufferings of the expelled clergy one of their number, Richard Baxter, has given us an account. "Many

hundreds of them with their wives and children had neither house nor bread. . . . Their congregations had enough to do, besides a small maintenance, to help them out of prisons or to maintain them there. Though they were as frugal as possible, they could hardly live; some lived on little more than brown bread and water, many had but eight or ten pounds a year to maintain a family, so that a piece of flesh has not come to one of their tables in six weeks' time; their allowance could scarce afford them bread and cheese. One went to plow six days and preached on the Lord's Day. Another was forced to cut tobacco for a livelihood." But poverty was the least of their sufferings. They were jeered at by the players. They were hooted through the streets by the mob. "Many of the ministers being afraid to lay down their ministry after they had been ordained to it, preached to such as would hear them in fields and private houses, till they were apprehended and cast into jails, where many of them perished." They were excommunicated in the bishop's court or fined for non-attendance at church; and a crowd of informers grew up who made a trade of detecting the meetings they held at midnight. Alleyn, the author of the well-known "Alarm to the Unconverted," died at thirty-six from the sufferings he endured in Taunton jail. Vavasour Powell, the apostle of Wales, spent the eleven years which followed the restoration in prisons at Shrewsbury, Southsea, and Cardiff, till he perished in the Fleet.

1200. The success, however, of this experiment in the repression of religious opinion rested mainly on

the absence of any disturbing influences from without; and in the midst of his triumph over his opponents at home, Clarendon was watching anxiously the growth of a quarrel which threatened war with the Dutch. The old commercial jealousy between the two rival merchant nations, which had been lulled in 1662 by a formal treaty of peace, but which still lived on in petty squabbles at sea, was imbittered by the cession of Bombay—a port which gave England an entry into the profitable trade with India—as well as by the establishment of a West Indian company in London which opened a traffic with the Gold Coast of Africa, and brought back from Guinea the gold from which our first "guineas" were struck. In both countries there was a general irritation which vented itself in cries for war, and in the session of 1664 the English Parliament presented an address to the crown praying for the exaction of redress for wrongs done by the Dutch to English merchants. But the squabble was of long standing, and there was nothing to threaten any immediate strife. Charles himself, indeed, shrank from wars which he foresaw would leave him at the mercy of his parliament; and Clarendon with Ormond, the bishops, and the whole church party, were conscious that the maintenance of peace was needful for their system of religious repression. The quarrel, therefore, would have dragged on in endless recriminations had not the restless hatred of the chancellor's opponents seen in it a means of bringing about the end in which they had as yet been foiled. Bennet and the court, Ashley and the Presbyterian party in the council, Bristol and

the Catholics, foresaw that the pressure of such a war, the burdens it would bring with it, and the supplies for which he would be driven to ask, would soon ruin the chancellor's popularity with the commons. Stripped of their support, it was easy to bring about his fall and clear the stage for fresh efforts after a religious toleration. The popular temper made their task of forcing on a war an easy one. The king was won over, partly by playing on his old resentment at the insults he had suffered from Holland during his exile, partly by his hope that the suffering which war would bring on Holland would end in the overthrow of the aristocratic republicans who had governed the united provinces ever since the fall of the house of Orange, and in the restoration of his young nephew, William of Orange, to the old influence of his family over the state. Such a restoration would not only repay the debt of gratitude which the royalist cause owed to the efforts of William's father in its support, but would remove the dread which the English government never ceased to feel of the encouragement which the dissidents at home derived from the mere existence close by of a presbyterian and republican government in Holland. Against the combined pressure of the king, the people, and his enemies in the cabinet and the court, Clarendon was unable to contend. Attacks on the Dutch settlements on the Gold Coast and the American coast made war inevitable; a fleet was manned; and at the close of 1664 the parliament, in a fit of unwonted enthusiasm, voted two millions and a half for the coming struggle.

1201. The war at sea which followed was a war of

giants. No such mighty fleets have ever disputed the sovereignty of the seas, nor have any naval battles equaled the encounters of the two nations in dogged and obstinate fighting. In the spring of 1665 the two fleets, each a hundred ships strong, mustered in the channel, the Dutch under Opdam, the English under the Duke of York. Their first battle off Lowestoft, obstinate as all the engagements between the two nations, ended in a victory for the English, a victory due chiefly to the superiority of their guns and to a shot which blew up the flag-ship of the Dutch admiral in the midst of the engagement. But the thought of triumph was soon forgotten in a terrible calamity which now fell on London. In six months a hundred thousand Londoners died of the plague which broke out in May in the crowded streets of the capital, and which drove the parliament from London to assemble in October at Oxford. To the dismay caused by the plague was added the growing irritation at the increasing pressure of the war, and a sense of the grave dangers into which the struggle with Holland was plunging the country both at home and abroad. The enormous grant which had been made at the outset for three years was already spent and a fresh supply had to be granted. But, hard and costly as the Dutch war had proved, a far graver and costlier struggle seemed opening in its train. The war was a serious stumbling-block in the way of the French projects. Holland on the strength of old treaties, England on the strength of her new friendship, alike called on Louis for aid; but to give aid to either was to run the risk of throwing the other on

the aid of the house of Austria, and of building up the league which could alone check France in its designs upon Spain. Only peace could keep the European states disunited, and it was on their disunion that Louis counted for success in his design of seizing Flanders, a design which was now all but ripe for execution. At the outset of the war, therefore, he offered his mediation, and suggested the terms of a compromise. But his attempt was fruitless, and the defeat off Lowestoft forced him to more effective action. He declared himself forced to give aid to the Dutch; though he cautiously restricted his help to the promise of a naval reinforcement. But the chief work of his negotiators was to prevent any extension of the struggle. Sweden and Brandenburg, from both of which powers Charles counted on support, were held in check by the intervention of France; and the Bishop of Münster, whom an English subsidy had roused to an attack on his Dutch neighbors, was forced by the influence of Louis to withdraw his troops. Sir William Temple, the English ambassador at Brussels, strove to enlist Spain on the side of England by promising to bring about a treaty between that country and Portugal which would free its hands from an attack on Louis, and so anticipate his plans for an attack under more favorable circumstances on herself. But Louis knew how to play on the Catholic bigotry of Spain, and the English offers were set aside.

1202. Louis thus succeeded in isolating England and in narrowing the war within the limits of a struggle at sea, a struggle in which the two great sea-

powers could only weaken one another to the profit of his own powerful navy. But his intervention was far from scaring England into peace. The old hatred of France had quickened the English people to an early perception of the dangers which were to spring from French ambition; and as early as 1661 the London mob backed the Spanish ambassador in a street squabble for precedence with the ambassador of France. "We do all naturally love the Spanish," Pepys comments on this at the time, "and hate the French." The marriage of Catharine, the sale of Dunkirk, were taken as signs of the growth of a French influence over English policy, and the jealousy and suspicion they had aroused were seen in the reception with which the parliament met the announcement of Louis's hostility. No sooner had the words fallen from Charles's lips than "there was a great noise in the parliament," writes the French statesman Louvois, "to show the joy of the two houses at the prospect of a fight with us." But even the warlike temper of the parliament could not blind it to the new weight which was given to the struggle by this intervention of France. Above all, it woke men to the dangers at home. The policy of Clarendon had broken England into two nations. Whatever might be the attitude of Monk or Ashley in the royal closet, the sympathies of the non-conformists as a whole could not fail to be opposed to a war with the Dutch; and as Charles was striving, with some show of success, to rouse the Orange party in the states to active opposition against the dominant republicans, so the Dutch statesmen summoned the

banished regicides to Holland, and dreamed of a landing in England which would bring about a general rising of the dissidents against Charles. The less scrupulous diplomacy of Louis availed itself of every element of opposition, called Algernon Sidney to Paris and supplied him with money as a possible means of rousing the English republicans, while it corresponded with the Presbyterians in Scotland and the hardly less bitter Catholics of Ireland.

1203. The dread of internal revolt was quickened by the new attitude of resistance taken by the non-conformists. When the clergy fled from London at the appearance of the plague, their pulpits were boldly occupied in open defiance of the law by the ministers who had been ejected from them. The terror and hatred roused by this revival of a foe that seemed to have been crushed was seen in the five-mile act, which completed in 1665 the code of persecution. By its provisions every clergyman who had been driven out by the act of uniformity was called on to swear that he held it unlawful, under any pretext, to take up arms against the king, and that he would at no time "endeavor any alteration of government in church or state." In case of refusal he was forbidden to go within five miles of any borough or of any place where he had been wont to minister. As the main body of the non-conformists belonged to the city and trading classes, the effect of this measure was to rob them of any religious teaching at all. But the tide of religious intolerance was now slowly ebbing, and, bigoted as the house was, a motion to impose the oath of the five-

mile act on every person in the nation was rejected in the same session by a majority of six. The sufferings of the non-conformists, indeed, could hardly fail to tell on the sympathies of the people. The thirst for revenge which had been roused by the tyranny of the Presbyterians in their hour of triumph was satisfied by their humiliation in their hour of defeat. The sight of pious and learned clergymen driven from their homes and their flocks, of religious meetings broken up by the constables, of preachers set side by side with thieves and outcasts in the dock, of jails crammed with honest enthusiasts whose piety was their only crime, pleaded more eloquently for toleration than all the reasoning in the world.

1204. We have a clue to the extent of the persecution from what we know to have been its effect on a single sect. The Quakers had excited alarm by their extravagances of manner as well as by their refusal to bear arms or to take oaths, and a special act was passed for their repression. They were one of the smallest of the non-conformist bodies, but more than four thousand were soon in prison, and five hundred of these were imprisoned in London alone. The king's declaration of indulgence twelve years later set free twelve hundred Quakers who had found their way to the jails. For not only had persecution failed to kill religious liberty, bnt the very Puritanism which the cavalier parliament believed itself to have trodden under foot was at this moment proving the noble life it had drawn from suffering and defeat. It was at this moment that Milton pro-

duced the "Paradise Lost." During the civil war he had been engaged in strife with Presbyterians and with royalists, pleading for civil and religious freedom, for freedom of social life, and freedom of the press. At a later time he became Latin secretary to the protector in spite of a blindness which had been brought on by the intensity of his study. The restoration found him, of all living men, the most hateful to the royalists, for it was his "Defence of the English People" which had justified throughout Europe the execution of the king. Parliament ordered his book to be burned by the common hangman; he was for a time imprisoned; and even when released he had to live amid threats of assassination from fanatical cavaliers. To the ruin of his cause were added personal misfortunes in the bankruptcy of the scrivener who held the bulk of his property, and in the fire of London, which deprived him of much of what was left. As age drew on he found himself reduced to comparative poverty, and driven to sell his library for subsistence. Even among the sectaries who shared his political opinions Milton stood in religious opinion alone, for he had gradually severed himself from every accepted form of faith, had embraced Arianism, and had ceased to attend at any place of worship.

1205. Nor was his home a happy one. The grace and geniality of his youth disappeared in the drudgery of a schoolmaster's life and among the invectives of controversy. In age his temper became stern and exacting. His daughters, who were forced to read to their blind father in languages which they could

not understand, revolted against their bondage. But solitude and misfortune only brought into bolder relief Milton's inner greatness. There was a grand simplicity in the life of his later years. He listened every morning to a chapter of the Hebrew bible, and after musing in silence for a while pursued his studies till mid-day. Then he took exercise for an hour, played for another hour on the organ or viol, and renewed his studies The evening was spent in converse with visitors and friends. For, lonely and unpopular as Milton was, there was one thing about him which made his house in Bunhill Fields a place of pilgrimage to the wits of the restoration. He was the last of the Elizabethans. He had possibly seen Shakespeare, as, on his visits to London, after his retirement to Stratford, the playwright passed along Bread Street to his wit-combats at the Mermaid. He had been the contemporary of Webster and Massinger, of Herrick and Crashaw. His "Comus" and "Arcades" had rivaled the masks of Ben Jonson. It was with a reverence drawn from thoughts like these that men looked on the blind poet as he sat, clad in black, in his chamber hung with rusty green tapestry, his fair brown hair falling, as of old, over a calm, serene face that still retained much of its youthful beauty, his cheeks delicately colored, his clear gray eyes showing no trace of their blindness. But famous, whether for good or ill, as his prose writings had made him, during fifteen years only a few sonnets had broken his silence as a singer. It was now, in his blindness and old age, with the cause he loved trodden under foot by men as vile as

the rabble in "Comus," that the genius of Milton took refuge in the great poem on which, through years of silence, his imagination had been brooding.

1206. On his return from his travels in Italy Milton spoke of himself as musing on "a work not to be raised from the heat of youth or the vapors of wine, like that which flows at waste from the pen of some vulgar amorist or the trencher-fury of a rhyming parasite, nor to be obtained by the invocation of dame Memory and her siren daughters, but by devout prayer to that Eternal Spirit who can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out his scraphim with the hallowed fire of his altar to touch and purify the lips of whom he pleases." His lips were touched at last. In the quiet retreat of his home in Bunhill Fields he mused during these years of persecution and loneliness on the "Paradise Lost." The poem was published in 1667, seven years after the restoration, and four years later appeared the "Paradise Regained" and "Samson Agonistes," in the severe grandeur of whose verse we see the poet himself "fallen," like Samson, "on evil days and evil tongues, with darkness and with danger compassed round." But, great as the two last works were, their greatness was eclipsed by that of their predecessor. The whole genius of Milton expressed itself in the "Paradise Lost." The romance, the gorgeous fancy, the daring imagination which he shared with the Elizabethan poets, the large but ordered beauty which he had drunk in from the literature of Greece and Rome, the sublimity of conception, the loftiness of phrase which he owed to

the Bible blended in this story "of man's first disobedience, and the fruit of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste brought death into the world and all our woe." It is only when we review the strangely mingled elements which make up the poem that we realize the genius which fused them into such a perfect whole. The meager outline of the Hebrew legend is lost in the splendor and music of Milton's verse. The stern idealism of Geneva is clothed in the gorgeous robes of the renascence. If we miss something of the free play of Spenser's fancy, and yet more of the imaginative delight in their own creations which gives so exquisite a life to the poetry of the early dramatists, we find in place of these the noblest example which our literature affords of the majesty of classic form.

1207. But it is not with the literary value of the "Paradise Lost" that we are here concerned. Its historic importance lies in this, that it is the epic of Puritanism. Its scheme is the problem with which the Puritan wrestled in hours of gloom and darkness —the problem of sin and redemption, of the world-wide struggle of evil against good. The intense moral concentration of the Puritan had given an almost bodily shape to spiritual abstractions before Milton gave life and being to the forms of sin and death. It was the Puritan tendency to mass, into one vast "body of sin," the various forms of human evil, and by the very force of a passionate hatred to exaggerate their magnitude and their power, to which we owe the conception of Milton's Satan. The greatness of the Puritan aim in the long and waver-

ing struggle for justice and law and a higher good, the grandeur of character which the contest developed, the colossal forms of good and evil which moved over its stage, the debates and conspiracies and battles which had been men's life for twenty years, the mighty eloquence and the mightier ambition which the war had roused into being—all left their mark on the "Paradise Lost." Whatever was highest and best in the Puritan temper spoke in the nobleness and elevation of the poem, in its purity of tone, in its loftiness of conception, in its ordered and equitable realization of a great purpose. Even in his boldest flights Milton is calm and master of himself. His touch is always sure. Whether he passes from heaven to hell or from the council hall of Satan to the sweet conference of Adam and Eve, his tread is steady and unfaltering.

1208. But if the poem expresses the higher qualities of the Puritan temper it expresses no less exactly its defects. Throughout it we feel almost painfully a want of the finer and subtler sympathies, of a large and genial humanity, of a sense of spiritual mystery. Dealing as Milton does with subjects the most awful and mysterious that poet ever chose, he is never troubled by the obstinate questionings of invisible things which haunted the imagination of Shakespeare. We look in vain for any Æschylean background of the vast unknown. "Man's disobedience" and the scheme for man's redemption are laid down as clearly and with just as little mystery as in a Puritan discourse. On topics such as these, even God the Father (to borrow Pope's sneer) "turns a school divine."

As in his earlier poems he had ordered and arranged nature, so in the "Paradise Lost" Milton orders and arranges heaven and hell. His mightiest figures, angel or archangel, Satan or Belial, stand out colossal but distinct. There is just as little of the wide sympathy with all that is human which is so lovable in Chaucer and Shakespeare. On the contrary, the Puritan individuality is nowhere so overpowering as in Milton. He leaves the stamp of himself deeply graven on all he creates. We hear his voice in every line of his poem. The cold, severe conception of moral virtue which reigns throughout it, the intellectual way in which he paints and regards beauty (for the beauty of Eve is a beauty which no mortal man may love), are Milton's own. We feel his inmost temper in the stoical self repression which gives its dignity to his figures. Adam utters no cry of agony when he is driven from Paradise. Satan suffers in a defiant silence. It is to this intense self-concentration that we must attribute the strange deficiency of humor which the poet shared with the Puritans generally, and which here and there breaks the sublimity of the poem with strange slips into the grotesque. But it is, above all, to this Puritan deficiency in human sympathy that we must attribute Milton's wonderful want of dramatic genius. Of the power which creates a thousand different characters, which endows each with its appropriate act and word, which loses itself in its own creations, no great poet ever had less.

1209. While Milton was busy with his verse, events were moving fast in favor of the cause which

he saw trodden under foot. Defeat had only spurred the Dutch to fresh efforts. Their best seaman, De Ruyter, had reorganized their fleet, and appeared off the North Foreland in May, 1666, with eighty-eight vessels, stronger and better armed than those of Opdam. The English fleet was almost as strong; but a squadron had been detached under Prince Rupert to meet a French force reported to be at Belle Isle, and it was with but sixty ships that the new admiral, Monk Duke of Albemarle, fell in with De Ruyter's armament. There was no thought, however, of retreat, and a fight at once began, the longest and most stubborn that the seas have ever seen. The battle had raged for two whole days, and Monk, left with only sixteen ships uninjured, saw himself on the brink of ruin, when on the morning of the third he was saved by the arrival of Rupert. Though still greatly inferior in force, the dogged admiral renewed the fight on the fourth day as the Dutch drew off to their own coast, but the combat again ended in De Ruyter's favor and the English took refuge in the Thames. Their fleet was indeed ruined; twenty ships had been taken or sunk and a far larger number disabled; but the losses of the enemy had been hardly less. What the Dutch had discovered, owned De Witt, was, "that English sailors might be killed and English ships burned, but that there was no conquering Englishmen." At the close of July, in fact, the two fleets, again refitted, met anew off the North Foreland, and a second fight, as hard fought as that which had gone before, ended in an English victory. Twenty Dutch sail

had struck or sunk, 7000 Dutch seamen had been slain, while the English loss was comparatively small. The victorious fleet sailed along the rich coast of Holland, burning merchantmen and plundering its undefended towns. But Holland was as unconquerable as England herself. In a short time the Dutch fleet was again refitted and at sea, and Louis, whose aid had hitherto been only in words, thought it time to act. The French fleet joined the Dutch, and the English found themselves too inferior in force to venture on a fresh battle for the command of the channel.

1210. It was at this moment of national disappointment, with the fruit of great efforts snatched away and the sea lost, that a fresh calamity at home was added to the sufferings of the war. In the night of the 2d of September a fire broke out in the heart of London which raged for four days and reduced the city to ashes from the Tower to the Temple. Thirteen hundred houses and ninety churches were destroyed. The loss of merchandise and property was beyond count. Again the parliament, with stubborn pride, voted a subsidy of nearly two millions to refit the fleet. But the money came in slowly. The treasury was so utterly drained that it was agreed to fit out no large ships for the coming year. The ministers, indeed, were already seeking to conclude a peace through the mediation of France. It was not the public distress alone which drove Clarendon to peace negotiations; his own fears and those of the king had been alike fulfilled as the war went on. The country squires were disgusted at the obstinacy

and cost of the struggle, and they visited their disgust on Clarendon as its supposed author. He had lost the support of the houses, and the admission of fresh opponents into the royal council spoke of the secret enmity of the king. But Charles, too, had his reasons for desiring peace. He had a sleepless distrust of parliaments, and his distrust was already justified. The "cavalier" parliament had met in a passion of loyalty. It had pressed for the death of the regicides. It had hardly been hindered from throwing all England into confusion by refusing its assent to the amnesty bill. It had ordered the league and covenant, as well as the act deposing Charles Stuart, to be burned by the common hangman. It had declared the taking up arms against the king on any pretext to be treason, and had turned its declaration into a test to be exacted from every parson and every alderman. And yet this loyal parliament had faced and checked the crown as boldly and pertinaciously as the Long Parliament itself. It had carried out its own ecclesiastical policy in the teeth of the known wishes of the king. It had humiliated him by forcing him to cancel his public declaration in favor of the non-conformists. It gave counsel in foreign affairs, and met the king's leanings toward Louis by expressions of its will for a contest with France. It voted large subsidies, indeed, but at this juncture it inserted into the subsidy bill a clause which appointed a parliamentary commission with powers to examine into the royal expenditure, and to question royal officers upon oath.

1211. To Clarendon such a demand seemed as

great an usurpation on the rights of the crown as any measure of the Long Parliament, and he advised a dissolution. But the advice was rejected, for there was no hope that fresh elections could bring together a more royalist house of commons than that of 1661. The attitude of the houses showed, in fact, that the hottest royalists had learned, whether they would or no, the lesson of the civil war. Whatever might, in other ways, be the temper of the commons who assembled at Westminster, it was certain that the great constitutional revolution which was slowly removing the control of affairs from the hands of the crown into those of the parliament would go just as steadily on. But if Charles refused to dissolve the parliament, he longed to free himself from its power; and the mediation of France enabled a peace congress to assemble at Breda in May, 1667. To Holland, eager to free its hands so as to deal with the French invasion of the Netherlands, an invasion which was now felt to be impending, peace was yet more important than to England; and a stroke of singular vigor placed peace within her grasp. Aware of the exhaustion of the English treasury and of the miserable state of the English navy, the persevering De Witt suddenly ordered the Dutch fleet, sixty vessels strong, to sail in June to the Thames. England was taken utterly by surprise. Neither ships nor forts were manned when the Hollanders appeared at the Nore. Pushing their light vessels without show of opposition up the Thames to Gravesend, they forced the boom which protected the Medway, burned three men-of-war which lay

anchored in the river, and withdrew only to sail proudly along the coast, the masters of the channel.

1212. The thunder of the Dutch guns in the Medway and the Thames woke England to a bitter sense of its degradation. The dream of loyalty was roughly broken. "Everybody nowadays," Pepys tells us, "reflects upon Oliver and commends him: what brave things he did, and made all the neighbor princes fear him." But Oliver's successor was coolly watching this shame and discontent of his people with the one aim of turning it to his own advantage. To Charles the Second the degradation of England was only a move in the political game which he was playing, a game played with so consummate a secresy and skill that it not only deceived close observers of his own day, but still misleads historians in ours. The blow at once brought about the peace he desired. Each of the combatants retained what it had won, save that Holland gained the isle of Polaroon on the Bombay coast, and England the settlement of New Amsterdam on the Hudson, which was soon to be better known as her colony of New York. A result still more to the king's taste was the ruin of Clarendon. Clarendon had had no part in the reduction of the navy which had proved so fatal to English renown, but the public resentment fell on him alone. The parliament, enraged by his counsel for its dissolution, saw in his call for forces to defend the coast an attempt to re-establish the one thing they hated most, a standing army. Charles could at last free himself from the minister who had

held him in check so long. In August, 1667, the chancellor was dismissed from office, and driven by the express command of the king to take refuge in France.

CHAPTER II.

THE POPISH PLOT.

1667—1683.

1213. The fall of Clarendon marks a new epoch in the history of the restoration. By the exile of the Chancellor, the death of Lord Southampton, which had preceded, and the retirement of Ormond and Nicholas which followed it, the constitutional loyalists who had hitherto shaped the policy of the government disappeared from the royal council. The union between king, church, and parliament, on which their system had been based, was roughly dissolved. The house of commons, which had been elected in a passion of loyalty only six years before, found itself thrown into a position of antagonism to the crown. The church saw the most formidable opponent of its supremacy in the king.

1214. For the first time since his accession Charles came boldly forward to the front of public affairs. He had freed himself, as he believed, from the domination of the constitutional loyalists and of the ministers who represented them. The new ministry was mainly made up of that section of the original ministry of 1660 which then represented the Presbyterians, and which under Ashley's guidance had

bent to purchase toleration even at the cost of increasing the prerogatives of the crown. Ashley himself remained chancellor of the exchequer. The Duke of Buckingham, whose marriage with the daughter of Lord Fairfax allied him with the Presbyterians, and who carried on political relations even with the Independents, held a leading position in the new cabinet, though at first without office. Sir William Coventry, a bitter opponent of Clarendon, took his seat at the treasury board. The direction of Scotch affairs was left to Lord Lauderdale, a man of rough and insolent manner, but of striking ability, and whose political views coincided as yet mainly with those of Ashley. Two great posts, however, were filled by men whose elevation showed the new part which Charles himself was resolved to take in the task of administration. Foreign affairs the king determined to take into his own hands; and this was adroitly managed by the nomination of Henry Bennet, now become Earl of Arlington, as secretary of state. Bennet was a man of sense and experience, but he was flexible and unprincipled; he was in heart a Catholic, and ready to serve as a creature of the royal will. Thomas Lord Clifford, the new head of the treasury, was a Catholic by conviction and ready to sacrifice English freedom if the sacrifice would bring back England to his faith.

1215. Such was the ministry which, from the accidental coincidence of the initial letters of the names of five of its members with those which make up the word, was known as the cabal. But

the word cabala, or cabal, had as yet none of the odious meaning which after events attached to it; it meant, indeed, simply what we mean by "cabinet." Nor was there anything in the temper or conduct of the new ministers which foreboded ill. To all but the king and themselves the Catholic sympathies of Clifford and Arlington were unknown. The ministry seemed to represent the Presbyterians, and the Presbyterians as a party were true to the cause of freedom for which they had fought. Nor did the earlier acts of the "cabal" belie its origin. Few ministries, in fact, have shown at their outset greater vigor or wisdom. Its first work was the triple alliance. The warlike outburst of feeling in the parliament at the prospect of a struggle with France had warned the French and English kings that a strife which both desired rather to limit than to widen must be brought to an end. The dexterous delays of Charles were seconded by the eagerness with which Louis pressed on the peace of Breda between England and the Dutch. To Louis, indeed, it seemed as if the hour he had so long waited for was come. He had secured the neutrality of the emperor by a secret treaty which provided for a division of the Spanish dominions between the two monarchs in case the King of Spain died without an heir. England, as he believed, was held in check by Charles, and, like Holland, was too exhausted by the late war to meddle with a new one. On the very day, therefore, on which the treaty of Breda was signed, he sent in his formal claims on the Low Countries, and his army at once took the field.

Flanders was occupied, and six great fortresses secured in two months. Franche Comté was overrun in seventeen days.

1216. But the suddenness and completeness of the French success woke a general terror before which the king's skillful diplomacy gave way. Holland, roused to a sense of danger by the appearance of French arms on the Rhine, protested and appealed to England for aid; and though her appeals remained at first unanswered, even England was roused from her lethargy by the French seizure of the coast towns of Flanders. The earlier efforts of English diplomacy, indeed, were of a selfish and unscrupulous kind. Holland, Spain, and France were tempted in turn by secret offers of alliance. A treaty, offensive and defensive against all powers, for the defense of the Spanish Netherlands, was proposed to the Dutch. Spain was offered alliance and aid in return for the concession of free trade with her dominions in America and the Philippines. Before France was laid the project of an offensive and defensive alliance directed especially against Holland, and perhaps against Spain, in return for which England stipulated for admission to a share in the eventual partition of the Spanish dominions, and for an assignment to her in such a case of the Spanish empire in the New World. Each of these offers was alike refused. Spain looked on them as insincere. France regarded the terms of alliance as extravagant, while she was anxious to hold the Dutch to their present friendship and inactivity rather than to stir them to war. Holland itself,

while desirous to check French ambition, still clung to its French alliance.

1217. Repulsed as they were on every side, the need of action became clearer every hour to the English ministers. The common refusal of France and the Dutch roused fears that these powers were secretly leagued for a partition of the Netherlands between them. Wider views, too, gradually set aside the narrow dreams of merely national aggrandizement. To Ashley and his followers an increase of the French power seemed dangerous, not only to the European balance of power, but to English Protestantism. Even Arlington, Catholic as in heart he was, thought more of the political interests of England and of the invariable resolve of its statesmen since Elizabeth's day to keep the French out of Flanders, than of the interests of Catholicism. One course alone remained. To lull the general excitement, Louis had offered peace to Spain on terms either of the cession of Franche Comté or of the retention of his conquests in the Netherlands. The plan of John de Witt, the pensionary of Holland, was to take France at its word, and to force on Spain the acceptance of these terms by the joint pressure of England and the united provinces. It was this plan which England suddenly adopted. In the opening of 1668, Sir William Temple was dispatched to the Hague, and an alliance was concluded between England and Holland, in which Sweden, the third great Protestant power, was soon included.

1218. Few measures have won a greater popularity than this triple alliance. "It is the only good

public thing," says Pepys, "that hath been done since the king came to England." Even the tory Dryden counted among the worst of Shaftesbury's crimes that "the triple bond he broke." In form, indeed, the alliance simply bound Louis to adhere to terms of peace proposed by himself, and those advantageous terms, the possession of the southern half of Flanders and of a string of fortresses which practically left him master of the Spanish Netherlands. But, in fact, it utterly ruined his plans. His offer of peace had been meant only as a blind. At the moment when Temple reached the Hague, Louis was writing to his general, Turenne, "I am turning over in my head things that are far from impossible, and go to carry them into execution whatever they may cost." Three armies were ready to march at once on Spain, Germany, and the Netherlands, when the intervention of the three powers suddenly arrested these schemes of conquest and forced Louis to conclude peace at Aix-la-Chapelle. But the immediate gain was the least result of the triple alliance. It brought about that union of the powers of Europe against which, as Louis felt instinctively, his ambition would dash itself in vain. It was Arlington's aim to make the alliance the nucleus of a greater confederation; and he tried not only to perpetuate it, but to include within it the Swiss cantons, the empire, and the house of Austria. His efforts were foiled; but the "triple bond" bore within it the germs of the grand alliance which at last saved Europe. To England it at once brought back the reputation which she had lost since the

death of Cromwell. It was a sign of her re-entry on the general stage of European politics, and of her formal adoption of the balance of power as a policy essential to the welfare not of one or another nation, but of Europe at large.

1219. Louis was maddened by the check. But it was not so much the action of England which galled his pride as the action of Holland. That "a nation of shopkeepers," for Louis applied the phrase to the united provinces long before Napoleon applied it to England, should have foiled his plans at the very moment of their realization, "stung him," as he owned, "to the quick." He had always disliked the Dutch as Protestants and republicans; he hated them now as an obstacle which must be taken out of his way ere he could resume his projects upon Spain. If he refrained from an instant attack on them it was to nurse a surer revenge. Four years were spent in preparations for a decisive blow. The French army was gradually raised to 180,000 men, while Colbert created a fleet which rivaled that of Holland in number and equipment. The steady aim of French diplomacy, from the moment when Louis was forced to sign the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, was to isolate the united provinces, to secure the neutrality of the empire in any attack on them, to break the triple alliance by detaching Sweden from it and securing Charles, and to leave the Dutch without help save from the ineffectual goodwill of Brandenburg and Spain.

1220. In England the French designs were favored by the political difficulties which at once followed

on the fall of Clarendon. The new ministry, representing as it did the Presbyterian party and a policy of toleration, was in itself a declaration on the king's part that the executive power was no longer necessarily to act in harmonious co-operation with the parliament. Its first steps in releasing non-conformists from prison, in suffering conventicles to reopen, and suspending the operation of the act of uniformity, were in open defiance of the known will of the two houses. But when Charles again proposed to his counselors a general toleration he no longer found himself supported by them as in 1663. Even Ashley's mood was changed. The policy of the council, in fact, was determined by the look of public affairs abroad. The victories of Louis, the sudden revelation of the strength of France, roused even in the most tolerant minds a dread of Catholicism. Men felt instinctively that the very existence of Protestantism and with it of civil freedom was again to be at stake. Instead of toleration, therefore, the ministers pressed for a union of Protestants which would have utterly foiled the king's projects; and a scheme of Protestant comprehension which had been approved by the moderate divines on both sides, by Tillotson and Stillingfleet on the part of the church as well as by Manton and Baxter on the part of the non-conformists, was laid before the house of commons in the session of 1668. Even its rejection failed to bring back Ashley and his party to their old position. They were still for toleration. But they were for a toleration, the benefit of which did not extend to Catholics, "in respect

the laws have determined the principles of the Romish religion to be inconsistent with the safety of your majesty's person and government."

1221. Again Charles was baffled. He had overthrown Clarendon in the belief that the non-conformists must necessarily support him in the general reversal of Clarendon's policy. He found not only that to obtain a toleration for Catholics from his new ministers was as impossible as to obtain it from Clarendon himself, but that they were resolute to bring about that union of Protestants which Charles regarded as fatal to his designs and which the chancellor's policy had at any rate prevented. Luckily for the king, neither their new attitude at home nor their success abroad could win them the confidence of the house of commons. As soon as it met they became the object of bitter attack. Their comprehension bill was rejected. Their suspension of the penalties for non-conformity was denounced. "We shall remain unhappy," said one of the leaders of the commons, Sir Edward Seymour, "so long as his majesty retains his present counselors." It was, in fact, only by an early prorogation which was prolonged throughout the year that the ministers were saved from impeachment. Such a course, however, gave but a temporary respite; and Buckingham and Ashley pressed on Charles the advisability of a dissolution. The house of commons, they held, chosen as it had been eight years before in a moment of reaction, no longer really represented public opinion, and a new house would contain a larger proportion of members inclined to a policy of Protestant union.

But Charles refused to dissolve the house. A Protestant union, in fact, was precisely what he wished to avoid. The pressure of a parliament with Presbyterian leanings would be yet more fatal to the administrative independence he wished to maintain than a cavalier Parliament. Above all, such a parliament would at once force him to take up a distinctly Protestant attitude, and to place himself at the head of the Protestant states as the leader in a European resistance to the supremacy of Catholicism and of France as the representative of Catholicism. How little such an attitude was to the king's taste we have already seen. He had been stirred to a momentary pride by the success of the triple alliance, but he had never in heart abandoned his older policy. He still looked to France and to Catholicism as the most effective means of restoring his prerogative; and the sudden revelation of the power of Louis, however it might startle his ministers into anxiety for freedom and Protestantism, only roused in the heart of their royal master a longing to turn it to the advantage of his crown.

1222. Tempted, however, as he must have been to a new turn in his policy by the failure of his older plans at home and the display of French greatness, the sudden and decisive turn which he actually gave it was due, above all, to an event which, unknown as it as yet remained to Englishmen, was destined to exercise a vast influence from this moment on English politics. This was the conversion of his brother and presumptive successor, James Duke of York, to the Catholic faith. Though finally completed in the

spring of 1672, this had for some time been imminent. The dull, truthful temper of the duke hindered him from listening to his brother's remonstrances against this step; but Charles was far too keen-witted to be blind to the difficulties in which it was certain to involve him. That either churchman or Presbyterian should sit still and wait patiently the advent of a Catholic king, and above all a king whose temper would necessarily make him a Catholic bigot, was, as he foresaw, impossible. The step could not long be concealed; and when once it was known a demand would arise for the exclusion of James from the succession, or at the least for securities which would fetter the crown. Even if such a demand were surmounted a struggle between James and the parliament was in the end inevitable, and such a struggle, if it ever arose, could end only in the establishment of Catholicism and despotism or in the expulsion of James from the throne. To foresee these consequences required no great keenness of sight; they were as plainly foreseen by Ashley and the bulk of Englishmen, when once the truth was known, as by Charles. But Charles was far from contenting himself with foreseeing them. He resolved to anticipate the danger by hurrying on the struggle which was certain to come. France alone could help him in forcing despotism and Catholicism on England, and from this moment Charles surrendered himself utterly to France. He declared to Louis his purpose of entering into an alliance with him, offensive and defensive. He owned to being the only man in his kingdom who desired such a league,

but he was determined, he said, to realize his desire, whatever might be the sentiments of his ministers.

1223. His ministers, indeed, he meant either to bring over to his schemes or to outwit. Two of them, Arlington and Clifford, were Catholics in heart like the king; and in January, 1669, they were summoned with the Duke of York and two Catholic nobles, Lords Bellasys and Arundel, to a conference, in which Charles, after pledging them to secresy, declared himself a Catholic and asked their counsel as to the means of establishing the Catholic religion in his realm. It was resolved to apply to Louis for aid in this purpose; and Charles proceeded to seek from the king a "protection," to use the words of the French ambassador, "of which he always hoped to feel the powerful effects in the execution of his design of changing the present state of religion in England for a better, and of establishing his authority so as to be able to retain his subjects in the obedience they owe him." He was fully aware of the price he must pay for such a protection. Louis was bent on the ruin of Holland and the annexation of Flanders. With the ink of the triple alliance hardly dry Charles promised help in both these designs. The Netherlands, indeed, could not be saved if Holland fell, and the fall of Holland was as needful for the success of the plans of Charles as of Louis. It was impossible for Holland to look with indifference on the conversion of England into a Catholic power, and in the struggle to make it one the aid of the Dutch would be secured for the king's opponents. Charles offered, therefore, to declare his religion and to join

France in an attack on Holland if Louis would grant him a subsidy equal to a million a year. In the event of the king of Spain's death without a son, Charles pledged himself to support France in her claims upon Flanders, while Louis, made wiser by the results of his previous refusal, promised in such a case to assent to the designs of England on the Spanish dominions in America. On this basis, after a year's negotiations, a secret treaty was concluded in May, 1670, at Dover, in an interview between Charles and his sister Henrietta, the Duchess of Orleans. It provided that Charles should announce his conversion, and that in case of any disturbance arising from such a step he should be supported by a French army and a French subsidy. War was to be declared by both powers against Holland, England furnishing only a small land force, but bearing the chief burden of the contest at sea on condition of an annual subsidy of £300,000.

1224. Nothing marks better the political profligacy of the age than that Arlington, the author of the triple alliance, should have been chosen as the confidant of Charles in his treaty of Dover. But to all save Arlington and Clifford the king's change of religion, or his political aims, remained utterly unknown. It would have been impossible to obtain the consent of the party in the royal council which represented the old Presbyterians, of Ashley or Lauderdale or the Duke of Buckingham, to the treaty of Dover. But it was possible to trick them into approval of a war with Holland by playing on their desire for a toleration of the non-conformists. The

announcement of the king's Catholicism was therefore deferred; and a series of mock negotiations, carried on through Buckingham, ended in the conclusion of a sham treaty, which was communicated to Lauderdale and to Ashley, a treaty which suppressed all mention of the religious changes or of the promise of French aid in bringing them about, and simply stipulated for a joint war against the Dutch. In such a war there was no formal breach of the triple alliance, for the triple alliance only guarded against an attack on the dominions of Spain, and Ashley and his colleagues were lured into assent to it in 1671 by the promise of toleration.

1225. Toleration was still Ashley's first thought. He had provided for it, only a year before, in the constitution which he had drawn up, with the aid of Locke, for the new colony of Carolina, which drew its name from King Charles. He looked the more hopefully to the king that in Scotland toleration had already been brought about by the royal authority. Nowhere had the system of conformity been more rigidly carried out than in the northern kingdom. Not only was the renunciation of the covenant exacted from every parson and official, but it was proposed to extend it to every subject in the realm. The fall of Clarendon, however, at once brought about a change. Lauderdale, who now took the lead in Scotch affairs, published, in 1669, a royal decree, which enabled many of the Presbyterian ministers to return to their flocks. A parliament which was called under his influence not only recognized the royal supremacy, but owned the king's right to order

the government of the church, and to dispense with ecclesiastical laws. The new system was just set on foot in Scotland when Charles came forward to tempt his English ministers with the same pledge of toleration. With characteristic audacity he removed the one stumbling-block in the way of his project by yielding the point to which he had hitherto clung, and promising, as Ashley demanded, that no Catholic should be benefited by the indulgence. Whether the pledge of toleration was the only motive which induced the ministers to consent to the war with Holland, it is hard to tell. Ashley had shown, in bringing about the previous strife, that he was no friend of the Dutch. He regarded a close alliance with France as the one means by which Charles could find himself strong enough to maintain religious liberty against the pressure of the parliament. It is possible that, like most statesmen of the time, he looked on the ruin of Holland as a thing inevitable, and was willing to gain for England whatever he could out of the wreck. If the united provinces were to become a part of France, it was better that a part of their territory, and that the most important part, the Brill, Flushing, and the mouths of the Scheldt, should fall, as had been stipulated, to England, than that Louis should have all.

1226. But, whatever may have been the motives which influenced Ashley and his colleagues, the bargain was at last struck; and, now that his ministers were outwitted, it only remained for Charles to outwit his parliament. At the close of 1670 a large subsidy was demanded for the fleet, under the pretext

of upholding the triple alliance; and the subsidy was granted. In the spring of 1671 the two houses were adjourned, and vigorous preparations were made for the coming struggle. But, as the rumors of war gathered strength, the country at once became restless and dissatisfied. The power of Louis, the renewed persecutions of the Huguenots, had increased the national hatred of the French. Protestants' hearts, too, trembled, as Baxter tells us, at the menacing armaments of the "Catholic King." On the other hand, the sense of a common interest and a common danger had changed the old jealousy of Holland into a growing inclination toward the Dutch. Charles and his ministers stood almost alone in their resolve. "Nearly all the court and all the members of parliament that are in town," wrote the French ambassador, "make cabals to turn the king from his designs." Prince Rupert and the Duke of Ormond, the heads of the old royalist and constitutional party, supported the Dutch embassy which was sent to meet the offers of mediation made by Spain. So great was the pressure that Charles was only able to escape from it by plunging hastily into hostilities. In March, 1672, a captain in the king's service attacked a Dutch convoy in the channel. The attack was at once followed by a declaration of war, and fresh supplies were obtained for the coming struggle by closing the exchequer, and suspending, under Clifford's advice, the payment of either principal or interest on loans advanced to the public treasury. The suspension spread bankruptcy among half the goldsmiths of London; but, with the opening of the

war, Ashley and his colleagues gained the toleration they had bought so dear. By virtue of his ecclesiastical powers the king ordered "that all manner of penal laws on matters ecclesiastical, against whatever sort of non-conformists or recusants should be from that day suspended," and gave liberty of public worship to all dissidents save Catholics, who were allowed to say mass only in private houses.

1227. The effect of the declaration of indulgence went far to justify Ashley and his colleagues (if anything could justify their course) in the bargain by which they purchased toleration. Ministers returned after years of banishment to their homes and flocks. Chapels were reopened. The jails were emptied. Hundreds of Quakers, who had been the special objects of persecution, were set free to worship God after their own fashion. John Bunyan left the prison which had for twelve years been his home. We have seen the atmosphere of excited feeling in which the youth of Bunyan had been spent. From his childhood he heard heavenly voices and saw visions of heaven; from his childhood, too, he had been wrestling with an overpowering sense of sin, which sickness and repeated escapes from death did much, as he grew up, to deepen. But in spite of his self-reproaches his life was a religious one; and the purity and sobriety of his youth was shown by his admission, at seventeen, into the ranks of the "new model." Two years later the war was over, and Bunyan, though hardly twenty, found himself married, in 1645, to a "godly" wife, as young and penniless as himself. So poor were the young couple

that they could scarce muster a spoon and a plate between them, and the poverty of their home deepened, perhaps, the gloom of the young tinker's restlessness and religious depression. His wife did what she could to comfort him, teaching him again to read and write, for he had forgotten his school learning, and reading with him in two little "godly" books, which formed his library. But darkness only gathered the thicker round his imaginative soul. "I walked," he tells us of this time, "to a neighboring town; and sat down upon a settle in the street, and fell into a very deep pause about the most fearful state my sin had brought me to; and after a long musing I lifted up my head; but methought I saw as if the sun that shineth in the heavens did grudge to give me light, and as if the very stones in the street and tiles upon the houses did band themselves against me. Methought that they all combined together to banish me out of the world. I was abhorred of them, and wept to dwell among them, because I had sinned against the Saviour. Oh, how happy now was every creature over I; for they stood fast and kept their station. But I was gone and lost."

1228. At last in 1653, after more than two years of this struggle, the darkness broke. Bunyan felt himself "converted," and freed from the burden of his sin. He joined a Baptist church at Bedford, and a few years later he became famous as a preacher. As he held no formal post of minister in the congregation, his preaching, even under the protectorate, was illegal, and "gave great offense," he tells us, "to the doctors and priests of that county." He per-

sisted, however, with little real molestation, until the restoration, but only six months had passed after the king's return when he was committed to Bedford jail on a charge of preaching in unlicensed conventicles. His refusal to promise to abstain from preaching kept him there eleven years. The jail was crowded with prisoners like himself, and among them he continued his ministry, supporting himself by making tagged thread laces, and finding some comfort in the Bible, the "Book of Martyrs," and the writing materials which he was suffered to have with him in his prison. But he was in the prime of life; his age was thirty-two when he was imprisoned; and the inactivity and severance from his wife and little children was hard to bear. "The parting with my wife and poor children," he says, in words of simple pathos, "hath often been to me in this place as the pulling of the flesh from the bones, and that not only because I am somewhat too fond of those great mercies, but also because I should have often brought to my mind the many hardships, miseries, and wants that my poor family was like to meet with, should I be taken from them, especially my poor blind child, who lay nearer to my heart than all besides. Oh, the thoughts of the hardships I thought my poor blind one might go under would break my heart to pieces. 'Poor child,' thought I, 'what sorrow art thou like to have for thy portion in this world! Thou must be beaten, must beg, suffer hunger, cold, nakedness, and a thousand calamities, though I cannot now endure the wind should blow upon thee.'" But suffering could not break his pur-

pose, and Bunyan found compensation for the narrow bounds of his prison in the wonderful activity of his pen. Tracts, controversial treatises, poems, meditations, his "Grace Abounding," and his "Holy City," followed each other in quick succession. It was in his jail that he wrote the first and greatest part of his "Pilgrim's Progress."

1229. The book had only just been completed when the indulgence set Bunyan free. Its publication was the earliest result, indeed, of his deliverance, and the popularity which it enjoyed from the first proves that the religious sympathies of the English people were still mainly Puritan. Before Bunyan's death in 1688, ten editions of the "Pilgrim's Progress" had already been sold; and though even Cowper hardly dared to quote it a century later for fear of moving a smile in the polite world about him, its favor among the middle classes and the poor has grown steadily from its author's day to our own. It is now the most popular and the most widely known of all English books. In none do we see more clear ly the new imaginative force which had been given to the common life of Englishmen by their study of the Bible. Its English is the simplest and homeliest English which has ever been used by any great English writer; but it is the English of the Bible. The images of the "Pilgrim's Progress" are the images of prophet and evangelist; it borrows for its tenderer outbursts the very verse of the Song of Songs and pictures the heavenly city in the words of the Apocalypse. But so completely has the Bible become Bunyan's life that one feels its phrases as the natural

expression of his thoughts. He has lived in the Bible till its words have become his own. He has lived among its visions and voices of heaven till all sense of possible unreality has died away. He tells his tale with such a perfect naturalness that allegories become living things, that the Slough of Despond and Doubting Castle are as real to us as places we see every day, that we know Mr. Legality and Mr. Worldly Wiseman as if we had met them in the street. It is in this amazing reality of impersonation that Bunyan's imaginative genius specially displays itself. But this is far from being his only excellence. In its range, in its directness, in its simple grace, in the ease with which it changes from lively dialogue to dramatic action, from simple pathos to passionate earnestness, in the subtle and delicate fancy which often suffuses its childlike words, in its playful humor, its bold character-painting, in the even and balanced power which passes without effort from the Valley of the Shadow of Death to the land "where the shining ones commonly walked because it was on the borders of heaven," in its sunny kindliness unbroken by one bitter word, the "Pilgrim's Progress" is among the noblest of English poems. For if Puritanism had first discovered the poetry which contact with the spiritual world awakes in the meanest souls, Bunyan was the first of the Puritans who revealed this poetry to the outer world. The journey of Christian from the City of Destruction to the Heavenly City is simply a record of the life of such a Puritan as Bunyan himself, seen through an imaginative haze of spirit

ual idealism in which its commonest incidents are heightened and glorified. He is himself the pilgrim who flies from the City of Destruction, who climbs the hill Difficulty, who faces Apollyon, who sees his loved ones cross the river of Death toward the Heavenly City, and how, because "the hill on which the city was framed was higher than the clouds, they therefore went up through the region of the air, sweetly talking as they went."

1230. Great, however, as was the relief of the indulgence to men like Bunyan, it was difficult to wring from the bulk of the non-conformists any expression of gratitude or satisfaction. Dear as toleration was to them, the general interests of religion were dearer, and not only these, but national freedom was now at stake. Holland, the bulwark of Protestantism abroad, seemed to crumble into ruin at the first blow of France. Louis passed the Rhine on the 12th of June, and overran three of the states without opposition. It was only by skill and desperate courage that the Dutch ships under De Ruyter held the English fleet under the Duke of York at bay in an obstinate battle off the coast of Suffolk. Till almost the eve of the struggle, in fact, the Dutch had been wrapped in a false security. The French alliance had been their traditional policy since the days of Henry the Fourth, and it was especially dear to the great merchant class which had mounted to power on the fall of the house of Orange. John de Witt, the leader of this party, though he had been forced to conclude the triple alliance by the previous advance of Louis to the Rhine,

had expressly refused to join England in an attack on France, and still clung blindly to her friendship. His trust only broke down when the glare of the French watch-fires was seen from the walls of Amsterdam.

1231. For the moment, Holland lay crushed at the feet of Louis, but the arrogant demands of the conqueror roused again the stubborn courage which had wrested victory from Alva and worn out the pride of Philip the Second. De Witt was murdered in a popular tumult, and his fall called William, the Prince of Orange, to the head of the republic. The new stadtholder had hardly reached manhood; but he had no sooner taken the lead in public affairs than his great qualities made themselves felt. His earlier life had schooled him in a wonderful self-control. He had been left fatherless and all but friendless in childhood; he had been bred among men who regarded his very existence as a danger to the state; his words had been watched, his looks noted, his friends jealously withdrawn. In such an atmosphere the boy grew up silent, wary, self-contained, grave in temper, cold in demeanor, blunt and even repulsive in address. He was weak and sickly from his cradle, and manhood brought with it an asthma and consumption which shook his frame with a constant cough; his face was sullen and bloodless, and scored with deep lines which told of ceaseless pain. But beneath this cold and sickly presence lay a fiery and commanding temper, an immovable courage, and a political ability of the highest order. William was a born statesman. Neglected as his education

had been in other ways—for he knew nothing of letters or of art—he had been carefully trained in politics by John de Witt; and the wide knowledge with which in his first address to the states-general the young stadtholder reviewed the general state of Europe, the sagacity with which he calculated the chances of the struggle, at once won him the trust of his countrymen.

1232. Their trust was soon rewarded. The plot of the two courts hung for its success on the chances of a rapid surprise, and with the approach of winter, a season in which military operations were then suspended, all chance of a surprise was over. William rapidly turned the respite to good account. Young as he was, he displayed from the first the cool courage and dogged tenacity of his race. "Do you not see your country is lost?" asked the Duke of Buckingham when he was sent to negotiate at the Hague. "There is a sure way never to see it lost," replied William, "and that is to die in the last ditch." With the spring of 1673 the tide began to turn. Holland was saved, and province after province won back from the arms of France by William's dauntless resolve. Like his great ancestor, William the Silent, he was a luckless commander, and no general had to bear more frequent defeats. But he profited by defeat as other men profit by victory. His bravery, indeed, was of that nobler cast which rises to its height in moments of ruin and dismay. The coolness with which, boy-general as he was, he rallied his broken squadrons amid the rout of Seneff and wrested from Condé at the last the fruits of his vic-

tory moved his veteran opponent to a generous admiration. It was at such moments, indeed, that the real temper of the man broke through the veil of his usual reserve. A strange light flashed from his eyes as soon as he was under fire; and in the terror and confusion of defeat his cold and repulsive manner was thrown aside for an ease and gayety which charmed every soldier around him.

1233. The gallant struggle of the prince was hardly needed to win the sympathies of Englishmen to the cause of the Dutch. In the exultation of the first moment of triumph Charles had lavished honors on the leaders of both the parties in his cabinet. Clifford became lord treasurer, Ashley was made chancellor and raised to the earldom of Shaftesbury. But the dream of triumph soon passed away. The Duke of York had owned, at the outset of the war, that recourse could only be had to parliament when success had put Charles in a position "to obtain by force what he could not get by pleasanter ways." But the delay of winter exhausted the supplies which had been procured so unscrupulously, while the closing of the treasury had shaken credit and rendered it impossible to raise a loan. It was necessary, therefore, in 1673, though the success Charles had counted on was still delayed, to appeal to the commons. But the commons met in a mood of angry distrust. The war, unpopular as it was, they left alone. What overpowered all other feelings was a vague sense, which we know now to have been justified by the facts, that liberty and religion were being unscrupulously betrayed. There was a suspicion that the

whole armed force of the nation was in Catholic hands. The Duke of York was suspected of being in heart a Catholic, and he was in command of the fleet. Catholics had been placed as officers in the land force which was being raised for a descent upon Holland. Lady Castlemaine, the king's mistress, paraded her change of faith; and doubts were fast gathering over the Protestantism of the king. There was a general dread that a plot was on foot for the establishment of Catholicism and despotism, and that the war and the indulgence were parts of the plot.

1234. The change of temper in the commons was marked by the appearance of what was from that time called the country party, with Lord Russell, Lord Cavendish, and Sir William Coventry at its head, a party which sympathized with the desire of the non-conformists for religious toleration, but looked on it as its first duty to guard against the political and religious designs of the court. The house listened unmoved to the fiery address of the new lord chancellor in favor of the war, an address which ended with the phrase, "Delenda est Carthago," so often quoted against him afterward, as they listened unmoved to the king's declaration of his steady adherence to the indulgence. "I shall take it very ill," said Charles, with unusual haughtiness, "to receive contradiction in what I have done; and I will deal plainly with you, I am resolved to stick to my declaration." As to the declaration of indulgence, however, all parties in the house were at one. The commons resolved "that penal statutes in matters ecclesiastical cannot be suspended but by consent of

parliament," and refused supplies till the declaration was recalled. The king yielded after long hesitation, for the grant of supplies was still before the house, and France counseled compliance. But the declaration was no sooner recalled than the parliament passed from considerations of the past to provisions for the future. A test act was passed through both houses without opposition, which required that every one in the civil and military employment of the state should take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, subscribe a declaration against transubstantiation, and receive the sacrament according to the rites of the church of England. It was known that the dissidents were prepared to waive all objection either to oath or sacrament, and the result of the bill, therefore, was to bring Protestants, if not to union, yet a step nearer to one another. Catholics, on the other hand, were wholly excluded from all share in the government of the state. The act was fatal to the king's schemes, and Clifford at once counseled resistance, while Buckingham talked flightily about bringing the army to London. But the grant of a subsidy was still held in suspense till the test was accepted; and Arlington, who saw that all hope of carrying the "great plan" through was at an end, and looked to the test as a means of freeing himself from Clifford's rivalry in the cabinet, pressed Charles to yield. A dissolution, in fact, was the king's only resource, but in the temper of the nation a new parliament would have been yet more violent than the present one. Charles, therefore, sullenly gave his assent to the bill.

1235. Few measures have ever brought about more startling results than the test act. It was no sooner passed than the Duke of York owned himself a Catholic and resigned his office as lord high admiral. Throngs of excited people gathered round the lord treasurer's house at the news that Clifford, too, had owned to being a Catholic, and had laid down his staff of office. Their resignation was followed by that of hundreds of others in the army and the civil service of the crown. On public opinion the effect of these discoveries was wonderful. "I dare not write all the strange talk of the town," said Evelyn. The resignations were held to have proved the existence of the dangers which the test had been framed to meet. From this moment all trust in Charles was at an end. "The king," Shaftesbury said bitterly, "who, if he had been so happy as to have been born a private gentleman, had certainly passed for a man of good parts, excellent breeding, and well natured, hath now, being a prince, brought his affairs to that pass that there is not a person in the world, man or woman, that dares rely upon him or put any confidence in his word or friendship." The one man in England, indeed, on whom the discovery of the king's perfidy fell with the most crushing effect was Shaftesbury himself. Ashley Cooper had piqued himself on a penetration which read the characters of men around him and on a political instinct which discerned every coming change. He had bought, as he believed, the declaration of indulgence, the release of the imprisoned non-conformists, and freedom of worship for all dissidents, at the price of a consent

to the second attack on Holland; and he was looked on by the public at large as the minister most responsible both for the measures he advised and the measures he had nothing to do with. But, while facing the gathering storm of unpopularity, Ashley learnt in a moment of drunken confidence the secret of the king's religion. He owned to a friend "his trouble at the black cloud which was gathering over England;" but troubled as he was he still believed himself strong enough to use Charles for his own purposes. His acceptance of the chancellorship and of the earldom of Shaftesbury, as well as his violent defense of the war on opening the parliament, identified him yet more with the royal policy. It was after the opening of the parliament, if we credit the statement of the French ambassador, a statement which squares with the sudden change in his course, that he learnt from Arlington, who desired to secure his help in driving Clifford from the royal councils, the secret of the treaty of Dover.

1236. Whether this was so, or whether suspicion as in the people at large deepened into certainty Shaftesbury saw he had been duped. To the bitterness of such a discovery was added the bitterness of having aided in schemes which he abhorred. His change of policy was rapid and complete. He pressed in the royal council for the withdrawal of the declaration of indulgence. In parliament he supported the test act with extraordinary vehemence. But he was far from any thought of resigning his post. He clung to it, in fact, more tenaciously than ever, for the displacement of James and Clifford by the test

left him as he thought dominant in the royal council, and gave him hopes of revenging the deceit which had been practiced on him by forcing his policy on the king. He was resolved to end the war. He had dreams of meeting the danger of a Catholic successor by a dissolution of the king's marriage with Catharine, and by a fresh match with a Protestant princess. For the moment, indeed, Charles was helpless. He found himself, as he had told Louis long before, alone in his realm. The test act had been passed unanimously by both houses. Even the non-conformists deserted him and preferred persecution to the support of his plans. The dismissal of the Catholic officers made the employment of force, if he ever contemplated it, impossible, while the ill-success of the Dutch war robbed him of all hope of aid from France. The firmness of the Prince of Orange had roused the stubborn energy of his countrymen; the French conquests on land were slowly won back; and at sea the fleet of the allies was still held in check by the fine seamanship of De Ruyter. Nor was William less successful in diplomacy than in war. The house of Austria was at last stirred to action by the danger which threatened Europe; and its union with the united provinces laid the foundation of the grand alliance.

1237. Charles, indeed, was still firm to continue the war. He had gathered an army on the coast for a descent upon Holland, and he again sent his fleet to sea under Prince Rupert to clear the way for its landing. But the gallantry and seamanship of Van Tromp forced Rupert to withdraw after an indecisive

engagement, and the descent on the Dutch coast had become impossible when the parliament again met in October. The house was resolved upon peace, and Shaftesbury was as determined to end the war as the house itself. It was for this purpose that he threw himself into hearty alliance with the country party in the commons and welcomed the Duke of Ormond and Prince Rupert, who were looked upon as "great parliament men," back to the royal council. It was to Shaftesbury's influence that Charles attributed the dislike which the commons displayed to the war and their refusal of a grant of supplies for it until fresh religious securities were devised. It was at his instigation that an address was presented by both houses at the end of 1673 against the plan of marrying James to a Catholic princess, Mary of Modena, a plan which, as James was still without a male heir, promised to secure the succession, should a son be the result of the marriage, in a Catholic line. But Charles was not yet inclined to play the part of a mere puppet in other men's hands, and the projects of Shaftesbury were suddenly interrupted by an unexpected act of vigor on the part of the king. The houses were prorogued in November, and the chancellor was ordered to deliver up the seals.

1238. "It is only laying down my gown and buckling on my sword," Shaftesbury is said to have replied to the royal bidding; and though the words were innocent enough, for the sword was part of the usual dress of a gentleman which he must necessarily resume when he laid aside the gown of the

chancellor, they were taken as conveying a covert threat. He was still determined to force on the king a peace with the states. But he looked forward to the dangers of the future with even greater anxiety than to those of the present. The Duke of York, the successor to the throne, had owned himself a Catholic; and almost every one agreed that securities for the national religion would be necessary in the case of his accession. But Shaftesbury saw, and it is his especial merit that he did see, that with a king like James, convinced of his divine right and bigoted in his religious fervor, securities were valueless. From the first he determined to force on Charles his brother's exclusion from the throne, and his resolve was justified by the revolution, which finally did the work he proposed to do. Unhappily he was equally determined to fight Charles with weapons as vile as his own. The result of Clifford's resignation, of James's acknowledgment of his conversion, had been to destroy all belief in the honesty of public men. A panic of distrust had begun. The fatal truth was whispered that Charles himself was a Catholic. In spite of the test act it was suspected that men Catholic in heart still held high office in the state, and we know that in Arlington's case the suspicion was just. Shaftesbury seized on this public alarm, stirred above all by a sense of inability to meet the secret dangers which day after day was disclosing, as the means of carrying out his plans. He began fanning the panic by tales of a papist rising in London, and of a coming Irish revolt with a French army to back it. He retired to

his house in the city to find security against a conspiracy which had been formed, he said, to cut his throat. Meanwhile he rapidly organized the country party in the parliament and placed himself openly at its head. An address for the removal of ministers "popishly affected or otherwise obnoxious or dangerous" was presented on the reassembling of the houses in 1674. The lower house called on the king to dismiss Lauderdale, Buckingham, and Arlington, and to disband the troops he had raised since 1664. A bill was brought in to prevent all Catholics from approaching the court; in other words, for removing James from the king's councils. A far more important bill was that of the Protestant securities, which was pressed by Shaftesbury, Halifax, and Carlisle, the leaders of the new opposition in the house of lords, a bill which enacted that any prince of the blood should forfeit his right to the crown on his marriage with a Catholic.

1239. The bill, which was the first sketch of the later exclusion bill, failed to pass, but its failure left the houses excited and alarmed. Shaftesbury intrigued busily in the city, corresponded with William of Orange, and pressed for a war with France, which Charles could only avert by an appeal to Louis, a subsidy from whom enabled him to prorogue the parliament. But Charles saw that the time had come to give way. Spain was now joining Holland, and a war with Spain would have deprived English merchants of their most lucrative branch of commerce. The refusal of supplies by the commons hastened the king's resolve. "Things

have turned out ill," he said to Temple with a burst of unusual petulance· "but had I been well served I might have made a good business of it." His concessions, however, were as usual complete. He dismissed Buckingham and Arlington from office. He made peace with the Dutch. But Charles was never more formidable than in the moment of defeat, and he had already determined on a new policy by which the efforts of Shaftesbury and the country party might be held at bay. Ever since the opening of his reign he had clung to a system of balance, had pitted churchmen against non-conformist, and Ashley against Clarendon, partly to preserve his own independence and partly with a view of winning some advantage to the Catholics from the political strife. The temper of the commons had enabled Clarendon to baffle the king's attempts; and on his fall Charles felt strong enough to abandon the attempt to preserve a political balance, and had sought to carry out his designs with the single support of the non-conformists. But the new policy had broken down like the old. The non-conformists refused to betray the cause of Protestantism, and Shaftesbury, their leader, was pressing on measures which would rob Catholicism of the hopes it had gained from the conversion of James. In straits like these, Charles resolved to win back the commons by boldly adopting the policy on which the house was set.

1240. The majority of its members were still a mass of cavalier churchmen, who regarded Sir Thomas Osborne, a dependent of Arlington's, as their representative in the royal councils. The king had al-

ready created Osborne Earl of Danby, and raised him to the post of lord treasurer in Clifford's room. In 1674 he frankly adopted the policy of Danby and of his party in the parliament. The policy of Danby was in the main that of Clarendon. He had all Clarendon's love of the church, his equal hatred of popery and dissent, his high notions of the prerogative tempered by a faith in parliament and the law. His policy rested, like Clarendon's, on a union between the king and the two houses. He was a staunch Protestant, and his English pride revolted against any scheme which involved dependence on France. But he was a staunch royalist. He wished for a French war, but he would not force the king to fight France against his will. His terror of popery failed to win him over to any plans for a change in the succession. The first efforts, indeed, of the king and his minister were directed to strengthen James's position by measures which would allay the popular panic. Mary, the duke's eldest child, and after him the presumptive heir to the crown, was confirmed by the royal order as a Protestant. It was through Mary, indeed, that Charles aimed at securing the Prince of Orange. The popularity of William throughout the Protestant world was great; and in England, as the terror of a popish king increased, men remembered that were James and his house excluded from the throne William, as the king's nephew, the son of his sister Mary, and the grandson of Charles the First, stood next in succession to the crown. The prince was drawn by his desire to detach England from the French alliance

into close connection with Shaftesbury and the leaders of the country party, and already pledges from this quarter had reached him that he should be declared heir to the throne. It was to meet this danger that Charles resolved to offer William the hand of the duke's daughter, Mary. Such a marriage secured James against the one formidable rival to his claims, while it opened to William a far safer chance of mounting the throne at his father-in-law's death in right of his wife. The prospect, too, of such a Protestant succession might well allay much of the panic which was spreading through the country as men looked forward to the accession of a Catholic king.

1241. The secret negotiations for this marriage which began at the close of 1674 were accompanied by conferences between Danby and the bishops which restored the union between the church and the crown. The first fruits of this agreement were seen in the rigorous enforcement of the law against conventicles and the exclusion of all Catholics from court; while the parliament which reassembled in 1675 was assured that the test act should be rigorously enforced. The change in the royal policy came not a moment too soon. As it was, the aid of the cavalier party which rallied round Danby hardly saved the king from the humiliation of being forced to recall the troops he still maintained in the French service. To gain a majority on this point Danby was forced to avail himself of a resource which from this time played, for nearly a hundred years, an important part in English politics. Every hour showed

more clearly how fatal to its healthy working was the abandonment of the reforms which the Long Parliament and Cromwell had introduced into the composition of the house of commons. The influence of that house was growing greater and greater on public affairs. In spite of the king's vigorous resistance it was reviewing expenditure, dictating its own policy in church and state, checking the royal action even in foreign affairs, denouncing ministers and driving them from office, meddling now even with the succession to the crown. It did this as representing the people, and yet the people could hardly be said to be represented. The counties alone really returned their own members, and in the counties the franchise was limited to freeholders. In all but the larger towns the nomination of members lay in the hands of close corporations. A large number of so-called boroughs had ceased to have any real existence at all. Their representatives were simply nominees of the crown or of neighboring land-owners.

1242. On great questions so imperfect a composition of the representative body mattered indeed little, for whatever were their origin the members shared in the general national feeling and expressed fairly the national sentiment. But in the common business of parliament and in questions of detail it told fatally on the temper of the house. The members were conscious of their power, but they were checked by little sense of responsibility for its exercise. They were open, therefore, to the meanest and most selfish influences. Charles had

done much by "closeting" them. Danby, bolder and less ingenious, trusted to coarser means. With him began the system of direct bribery which was to culminate in the parliamentary corruption of the Pelhams. He was more successful in winning back the majority of the commons from their alliance with the country party by reviving the old spirit of religious persecution. With the view of breaking up the growing union between the churchmen and the non-conformists, as well as of driving from parliament the Presbyterian members who formed the strength of the country party, and whose numbers increased as time brought fresh elections, he proposed that the test which had been imposed by Clarendon on municipal officers should be extended to all functionaries of the state, that every member of either house, every magistrate and public officer, should swear never to take arms against the king or to "endeavor any alteration of the Protestant religion now established by law in the church of England, or any alteration in the government in church and state as it is by law established." The bill was forced through the lords by the bishops and the cavalier party, and its passage through the commons was only averted by a quarrel on privilege between the two houses which Shaftesbury dexterously fanned into flame.

1243. On the other hand, the country party remained strong enough to hamper their grant of supplies with conditions which rendered it unacceptable to the king. Eager as they were for the war with France which Danby promised, the commons could

not trust the king; and Danby was soon to discover how wise their distrust had been. For the houses were no sooner prorogued in November, 1675, than Charles revealed to him the negotiations he had been all the while carrying on with Louis. To France, hard pressed as she was by the allies, the entry of England into the war would have been ruinous: and Louis was eager to avert this danger by promising Charles a subsidy should the parliament strive to force on him a war policy by refusing or limiting supplies. Charles, who still looked to France for aid in his plans, and who believed war would deliver him helplessly into the power of the parliament, was as ready to accept the money as Louis to give it. At this juncture, therefore, he called on Danby to sign a treaty by which, on consideration of a yearly pension guaranteed on the part of France, the two sovereigns bound themselves to enter into no engagements with other powers, and to lend each other aid in case of rebellion in their dominions. Such a treaty not only bound England to dependence on France, but freed the king from all parliamentary control. But his minister pleaded in vain for delay and for the advice of the council. Charles answered his entreaties by signing the treaty with his own hand.

1244. Danby found himself duped by the king as Shaftesbury had found himself duped; but his bold temper was only spurred to fresh plans for rescuing the king from his bondage to Louis To do this the first step was fully to reconcile the king and the parliament, which met again in February, 1677, after a prorogation of fifteen months. The country party

stood in the way of such a reconciliation, but Danby resolved to break its strength by measures of unscrupulous vigor for which a blunder of Shaftesbury's gave an opportunity. Shaftesbury despaired of bringing the house of commons, elected as it had been fifteen years before in a moment of religious and political reaction, to any steady opposition to the crown. He had already moved an address for its dissolution, and he now urged that, as a statute of Edward the Third ordained that parliaments should be held "once a year, or oftener if need be," the parliament, by the recent prorogation of a year and a half, had ceased legally to exist. The triennial act deprived such an argument of any force, and its only effect was to place the country party in an injudicious position of general hostility to the existing parliament. But Danby represented it as a contempt of the house, and the lords at his bidding committed its supporters, Shaftesbury, Buckingham, Salisbury, and Wharton, to the Tower. While the opposition cowered under the blow, Danby pushed on a measure which was designed to win back alarmed churchmen to confidence in the crown. The terror of a Catholic successor grew steadily throughout the country, and it was to meet this terror that Danby devised his bill for the security of the church. By this bill, it was provided that, on the succession of any king who was not a member of the established church, the appointment of bishops should be vested in the existing body of prelates, and that the king's children should be placed in the guardianship of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

1245. The bill, however, failed in the commons; and a grant of supply, unchecked by the appropriation of the money to special services, a limitation which Charles steadily opposed, was only obtained by Danby's profuse bribery. The progress of the war abroad, indeed, was rousing panic in England faster than Danby could allay it. New successes of the French arms in Flanders, and a defeat of the Prince of Orange at Cassel, stirred the whole country to a cry for war. The two houses united in an address to the crown, which prayed that England might enter into the great alliance that William had built up; but Charles parried the blow by demanding a supply before the war was declared, and by a new prorogation of the house on a new refusal. Fresh and larger subsidies from France enabled him to continue this prorogation for seven months. But the silence of the parliament did little to silence the country; and Danby took advantage of the popular cry for war to press an energetic course of action on the king. In its will to check French aggression the cavalier party was as earnest as the Puritan, and Danby aimed at redeeming his failure at home by uniting the parliament through a vigorous policy abroad.

1246. As usual, Charles appeared to give way. He was himself for the moment uneasy at the appearance of the French on the Flemish coast, and he owned that "he could never live at ease with his subjects" if Flanders were abandoned. He allowed Danby, therefore, to press on both parties the necessity for mutual concessions, and to define the new

attitude of England by reviving the project for a match between Mary and William of Orange. William's distrust of Arlington, by whom the proposal of it had been made to him, had led the prince at first to set aside the scheme, but he had never lost sight of it, and the counsels of Sir William Temple had brought him in 1677 to make overtures for its realization. Charles and Danby had still the same reasons for desiring it, and the marriage took place on William's visit to England in September. As the king was childless and James had no son, Mary was presumptive heiress of the crown. The marriage, therefore, promised a close political union in the future with Holland, and a corresponding opposition to the ambition of France. With the country it was popular as a Protestant match, and as insuring a Protestant successor to James. But Louis was bitterly angered; he rejected the English propositions of peace, and again sent his army in the field. Danby was ready to accept the challenge. The withdrawal of the English ambassador from Paris was followed, in 1678, by an assembly of the parliament; a warlike speech from the throne was answered by a warlike address from the house, large supplies were voted, and an army raised.

1247. But the actual declaration of war still failed to appear; indeed, Charles was in heart as disinclined for war as ever. While Danby threatened France, the king was busy turning the threat to his own profit, and gaining time by prorogations for a series of base negotiations. At one stage he demanded from Louis a fresh pension for the next

three years as the price of his good offices with the allies. Danby stooped to write the demand, and Charles added, "this letter is written by my order, C. R." A force of 3000 English soldiers was landed at Ostend; but the allies were already broken by their suspicions of the king's real policy, and Charles soon agreed for a fresh pension to recall the brigade. The bargain was hardly struck when Louis withdrew the terms of peace he had himself offered, and on the faith of which England had ostensibly retired from the scene. Once more Danby offered aid to the allies. But all faith in England had now disappeared. One hostile power after another gave assent to the new conditions laid down by France, and though Holland, the original cause of the war, was saved, the peace of Nimegwen, in July, 1678, made Louis the arbiter of Europe.

1248. Disgraceful as the peace was to England, it left Charles the master of a force of 20,000 men, levied for a war he had refused to declare. It left him, too, with nearly a million of French money in his pocket. His course had roused into fresh life the old suspicions of his perfidy, and of a secret plot with Louis for the ruin of English freedom and of English religion. That there was such a plot we know; and from the moment of the treaty of Dover the hopes of the Catholic party had mounted even faster than the panic of the Protestants. But they had been bitterly disappointed by the king's sudden withdrawal from the prosecution of his schemes after his four years' ineffectual struggle, and roused to wild anger by his seeming return to the policy of

Clarendon. Their anger and disappointment were revealed in the letters from English Jesuits, which were afterward to play so fatal a part in begetting a belief in the plot, and in the correspondence of Coleman. Coleman was secretary of the Duchess of York, and a busy intriguer, who had gained sufficient knowledge of the real plans of the king and of his brother to warrant him in begging money from Louis for the work of saving Catholic interests from Danby's hostility by intrigues in the parliament. A passage from one of his letters gives us a glimpse of the wild dreams which were stirring among the hotter Catholics of the time. "They had a mighty work on their hands," he wrote; "no less than the conversion of three kingdoms, and by that perhaps the utter subduing of a pestilent heresy which had so long domineered over a great part of the northern world. Success would give the greatest blow to the Protestant religion that it had received since its birth." But, while the despair of the Catholic party was unknown, their previous attitude of confidence had stirred suspicions in the public mind, which mounted into alarm when the peace of Nimegwen suddenly left Charles master—as it seemed—of the position, and it was of this general panic that one of the vile impostors, who are always thrown to the surface at times of great political agitation, was ready to take advantage by the invention of a popish plot.

1249. Titus Oates, a Baptist minister before the restoration, a curate and navy chaplain after it, but left penniless by his infamous repute, had sought bread in a conversion to Catholicism, and had been

received into Jesuit houses at Valladolid and St. Omer. While he remained there he learnt the fact of a secret meeting of the Jesuits in London, which was probably nothing but the usual congregation of the order, and on his expulsion, for misconduct, this single fact widened in his fertile brain into a plot for the subversion of Protestantism, and the death of the king. His story was laid before Charles in the August of 1678, and received, as was natural enough, with the cool incredulity of one who knew what plot there really had been; but Oates made affidavit of its truth before a London magistrate, Sir Edmondsbury Godfrey, and at last managed to appear before the council. He declared that he had been trusted with letters which disclosed the Jesuit plans. They were stirring rebellion in Ireland; in Scotland they disguised themselves as Cameronians; in England their aim was to assassinate the king and to leave the throne open to the papist Duke of York. The extracts from Jesuit letters, however, which he produced, though they showed the bitter disappointment and anger of their writers at the king's withdrawal from his schemes, threw no light on the monstrous charges of a plot for his assassination. Oates would have been dismissed, indeed, with contempt but for the seizure of Coleman's correspondence. The letters of this intriguer, believed as he was to be in the confidence of the Duke of York, gave a new color to the plot. Danby himself, conscious of the truth that there really were designs which Charles dared not avow, was shaken in his rejection of the disclosures, and inclined to use them as weapons to

check the king in his Catholic policy. But a more dexterous hand had already seized on the growing panic. Lord Shaftesbury, released after a long imprisonment from the Tower, ready since his discovery of the treaty of Dover to believe in any conspiracy between the Catholics and the king, and hopeless of foiling the king's policy in any other way, threw himself into the plot. "Let the treasurer cry as loud as he pleases against popery," he laughed, "I will cry a note louder." But no cry was needed to heighten the popular frenzy from the moment when Sir Edmondsbury Godfrey, the magistrate before whom Oates had laid his information, was found in a field near London with his sword run through his heart. His death was assumed to be murder, and the murder to be an attempt of the Jesuits to "stifle the plot." A solemn funeral added to the public agitation; and the two houses named committees to investigate the charges made by Oates.

1250. In this investigation Shaftesbury took the lead. Whatever his personal ambition may have been, his public aims in all that followed were wise and far-sighted. He aimed at forcing Charles to dissolve the parliament and appeal again to the nation. He aimed at driving Danby out of office, and at forcing on Charles a ministry which should break his dependence on France and give a constitutional turn to his policy. He saw that no security would really avail to meet the danger of a Catholic sovereign, and he aimed at excluding James from the throne. But in pursuing these aims he threw himself from that moment wholly on the plot. He

fanned the popular panic by accepting without question some fresh depositions in which Oates charged five Catholic peers with part in the Jesuit conspiracy. Two of these five, Lords Arundel and Bellasys, had in fact taken part in the preliminary conference which led to the treaty of Dover. Of this nothing was known, but the five were sent to the Tower and 2000 suspected persons were hurried to prison. A proclamation ordered every Catholic to leave London. The train-bands were called to arms, and patrols paraded through the streets to guard against the Catholic rising which Oates declared to be at hand. Meanwhile Shaftesbury turned the panic to political account. He fiercely demanded, in the house of lords, the exclusion of the Duke of York from the king's council, and his demand was repeated in an address of the commons. Charles met the attack with consummate skill. Anticipating the future exclusion bill, he declared himself ready to sanction any measures which secured the Protestant religion so long as they left untouched the right of hereditary succession and the just power of the crown. Shaftesbury retorted by forcing through parliament, at the end of 1678, a bill which excluded Catholics from a seat in either house. The exclusion remained in force for a century and a half; but it had really been aimed against the Duke of York, and Shaftesbury was defeated by a proviso which exempted James from the operation of the bill.

1251. The plot, which had been supported for four months by the sole evidence of Oates, began to hang fire at the opening of 1679; but a promise of reward

brought forward a villain named Bedloe, with tales beside which those of Oates seemed tame. The two informers were pressed forward by an infamous rivalry to stranger and stranger revelations. Bedloe swore to the existence of a plot for the landing of a Catholic army and a general massacre of the Protestants. Oates capped the revelations of Bedloe by charging the queen herself, at the bar of the lords, with knowledge of the plot to murder her husband. Monstrous as such charges were they revived the waning frenzy of the people and of the two houses. The peers under arrest were ordered to be impeached. A new proclamation enjoined the arrest of every Catholic in the realm. A series of judicial murders began with the trial and execution of Coleman which, even now, can only be remembered with horror. But the alarm must soon have worn out had it only been supported by perjury. What gave force to the false plot was the existence of a true one. Coleman's letters had won credit for the perjuries of Oates, and a fresh discovery now won credit for the perjuries of Bedloe.

1252. From the moment when the pressure of the commons and of Danby had forced Charles into a position of seeming antagonism to France, Louis had resolved to bring about the dissolution of the parliament, the fall of the minister, and the disbanding of the army which Danby still looked on as a weapon against him. The aims of the country party were the same as those of the French king, and even before the peace of Nimegwen the French ambassador, Barillon, had succeeded in opening a corre-

spondence on these points with its leaders, with Shaftesbury, Halifax, and Lord Russell. A closer connection was negotiated in 1678 through the mediation of Algernon Sidney; and money was intrusted to Russell and other prominent members of the country party by Barillon to be used in the bribery which, disgraceful as it was, was now almost necessary to counteract the bribery of Danby. The confederates soon brought a more effective weapon into play. The English ambassador at Paris, Ralph Montagu, returned home on a quarrel with Danby, obtained a seat in the house of commons, and in spite of the seizure of his papers laid on the table of the house the dispatch which had been forwarded to Louis, demanding payment for the king's services to France during the late negotiations. The commons were thunderstruck; for, strong as had been the general suspicion, the fact of the dependence of England on a foreign power had never before been proved. Danby's name was signed to the dispatch, and he was at once impeached on a charge of high treason. But Shaftesbury was more eager to secure the election of a new parliament than to punish his rival, and Charles was resolved to prevent at any price a trial which could not fail to reveal the disgraceful secret of his foreign policy. Charles was, in fact, at Shaftesbury's mercy, and the end for which Shaftesbury had been playing was at last secured. In January, 1679, the parliament of 1661, after the longest unbroken life in our parliamentary annals, was at last dissolved.

1253. A new parliament was at once summoned,

and its election took place in a tumult of national excitement. The process of parliamentary corruption now took a further step. Danby had begun the bribery of members. With the election of 1679 began, on a large and systematic scale, the bribery or "treating" of constituents. If members had come to realize the money-value of the seats they held, the voters for these members were quick to realize the money-value of the seats they bestowed. "I am told," writes the Venetian ambassador, Sarotti, "that in the more conspicuous and populous places their election will cost some of the candidates 5000 scudi (about £1000) each." The new members were still for the most part churchmen and country gentlemen, but they shared the alarm of the country, and even before their assembly in March their temper had told on the king's policy. James was sent to Brussels. Charles began to disband the army and promised that Danby should soon withdraw from office. In his speech from the throne he asked for supplies to maintain the Protestant attitude of his government in foreign affairs. But it was impossible to avert Danby's fall. The commons insisted on carrying his impeachment to the bar of the lords. It was necessary to dismiss him from his post of treasurer, and to construct a new ministry. In the existing temper of the houses such a ministry could only be found in the men who had brought about Danby's fall. Shaftesbury became president of the council, The chiefs of the country party, Lord Russell and Lord Cavendish, took their seats at the board with Lords Holles and Roberts, the older representatives

of the Presbyterian party which had merged in the general opposition. Savile Lord Halifax, as yet known only as a keen and ingenious speaker, entered the ministry in the train of Shaftesbury, with whom his family was connected. Lord Sunderland, a man adroit and unscrupulous, but as yet ranked in the opposition, was admitted to the council; while Lord Essex and Lord Capel, two of the most popular among the country leaders, went to the treasury. The recall of Sir William Temple, the negotiator of the triple alliance, from his embassy at the Hague to fill the post of secretary of state, promised a foreign policy which would again place England high among the European powers.

1254. Temple returned with a plan of administration which, fruitless as it directly proved, is of great importance as marking the silent change which was passing over the English constitution. Like many men of his time he was equally alarmed at the power both of the crown and of the parliament. In moments of national excitement the power of the houses seemed irresistible. They had overthrown Clarendon. They had overthrown Clifford and the cabal. They had just overthrown Danby. But, though they were strong enough in the end to punish ill government, they showed no power of securing good government, or of permanently influencing the policy of the crown. For nineteen years, in fact, with a parliament always sitting, Charles had had it pretty much his own way. He had made war against the will of the nation, and he had refused to make war when the nation demanded it. While every English-

man hated France, he had made England a mere dependency of the French king. The remedy for this state of things, as it was afterward found, was a very simple one. By a change which we shall have to trace, the ministry has now become a committee of state-officers named by the majority of the house of commons, from among the more prominent of its representatives in either house, whose object in accepting office is to do the will of that majority. So long as the majority of the house of commons itself represents the more powerful current of public opinion, it is clear that such an arrangement makes government an accurate reflection of the national will. But, obvious as such a plan may seem to us, it had as yet occurred to no English statesman. To Temple the one remedy seemed to lie in the restoration of the royal council to its older powers.

1255. This body, composed as it was of the great officers of the court, the royal treasurer and secretaries, and a few nobles specially summoned to it by the sovereign, formed up to the close of Elizabeth's reign a sort of deliberative assembly, to which the graver matters of public administration were commonly submitted by the crown. A practice, however, of previously submitting such measures to a smaller body of the more important councilors, must always have existed; and under James this secret committee, which was then known as the cabala or cabal, began almost wholly to supersede the council itself. In the large and balanced council which was formed after the restoration, all real power rested with the "cabala" of Clarendon, Southampton, Or-

mond, Monk, and the two secretaries; and on Clarendon's fall these were succeeded by Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley, and Lauderdale. It was by a mere coincidence that the initials of the latter names formed the word "cabal," which has ever since retained the sinister meaning their unpopularity gave to it. The effect of these smaller committees had undoubtedly been to remove the check which the larger numbers and the more popular composition of the royal council laid upon the crown. The unscrupulous projects which made the cabal of Clifford and his fellows a by-word among Englishmen, could never have been laid before a council of great peers and hereditary officers of state. To Temple, therefore, the organization of the council seemed to furnish a check on mere personal government which parliament was unable to supply. For this purpose he proposed that the cabala or cabinet, as it was now becoming the fashion to term the confidential committee of the council, should be abolished. The council itself was restricted to thirty members, and their joint income was not to fall below £300,000, a sum little less than what was estimated as the income of the whole house of commons. A body of great nobles and proprietors, not too numerous for secret deliberation and wealthy enough to counterbalance either the commons or the crown, would form, Temple hoped, a barrier against the violence and aggression of the one power, and a check on the mere despotism of the other.

1256. Whatever might be the fate of these schemes the new council and the new ministry gave fair hope

of a wise and patriotic government. But the difficulties were still great. The nation was frenzied with suspicion and panic. The elections to the new parliament had taken place amid a whirl of excitement which left no place for candidates of the court. The appointment of the new ministry, indeed, was welcomed with a general burst of joy, and its policy and that of the two houses showed at once that a more liberal spirit had entered into public affairs. In two remarkable acts of the new parliament English freedom made an advance even on the work of 1641. From the moment when printing began to tell on public opinion, it had been gagged by a system of licenses. The regulations framed under Henry the Eighth subjected the press to the control of the star-chamber, and the Martin Marprelate libels brought about a yet more stringent control under Elizabeth. Even the Long Parliament laid a heavy hand on the press, and the great remonstrance of Milton in his "Areopagitica" fell dead on the ears of his Puritan associates. But the statute for the regulation of printing which was passed immediately after the restoration expired finally in 1679, and the temper of the present parliament at once put an end to any attempt at re-establishing the censorship. To the new freedom of the press the habeas corpus act added new security for the personal freedom of every Englishman. Against arbitrary imprisonment, provision had been made in the earliest ages by a famous clause in the Great Charter. No free man could be held in prison save on charge or conviction of crime or for debt; and every prisoner on a criminal charge

could demand as a right from the court of king's bench the issue of a writ of "habeas corpus," which bound his jailer to produce both the prisoner and the warrant on which he was imprisoned, that the court might judge whether he was imprisoned according to law. In cases, however, of imprisonment on a warrant of the royal council it had been sometimes held by judges that the writ could not be issued, and under Clarendon's administration instances had, in this way, occurred of imprisonment without legal remedy. But his fall was quickly followed by the introduction of a bill to secure this right of the subject, and after a long struggle the act which is known as the habeas corpus act passed finally in the parliament of 1679. By this great statute the old practice of the law was freed from all difficulties and exceptions. Every prisoner committed for any crime save treason or felony was declared entitled to this writ even in the vacations of the courts, and heavy penalties were enforced on judges or jailers who refused him this right. Every person committed for felony or treason was entitled to be released on bail, unless indicted at the next session of jail delivery after his commitment, and to be discharged if not indicted at the sessions which followed. It was forbidden, under the heaviest penalties, to evade this operation of the writ, as it had been evaded under Clarendon, by sending a prisoner to any places or fortresses beyond the seas.

1257. Great as was the value of the habeas corpus act, it passed almost unnoticed amid the political storm which the ministry had to face. The question

of the succession threw all others into the shade. At the bottom of the national panic lay the dread of a Catholic king, a dread which the after-history of James fully justified. Unluckily, on the question of the succession, the new ministers were themselves divided. Shaftesbury was earnest for the exclusion of James, and he was followed in his plan of exclusion by Lord Russell. Against a change in the order of hereditary succession, however, Charles was firm; and he was supported in his resistance by a majority of the council, with Temple and Lord Essex, Lord Halifax, and Lord Sunderland at its head. It was with the assent of this party that Charles brought forward a plan for preserving the rights of the Duke of York while restraining his powers as sovereign. By this project the presentation to church livings was to be taken out of his hands on his accession. The last parliament of the preceding reign was to continue to sit; and the appointment of all councilors, judges, lord-lieutenants, and officers in the fleet was vested in the two houses so long as a Catholic sovereign was on the throne. The extent of these provisions showed the pressure which Charles felt, but Shaftesbury was undoubtedly right in setting the plan aside as at once insufficient and impracticable. The one real security for English freedom lay in a thorough understanding between king and parliament; and the scheme of Charles set them against one another as rival powers in the realm. It was impossible, in fact, that such a harmony could exist between a Protestant parliament and a Catholic sovereign.

1258. Shaftesbury, therefore, continued to advocate the exclusion in the royal council; and a bill for depriving James of his right to the crown and for devolving it on the next Protestant in the line of succession was introduced into the commons by his adherents. In spite of a powerful opposition from patriots like Lord Cavendish and Sir William Coventry, who still shrank from a change in the succession, the bill passed the house by a large majority. It was known that Charles would use his influence with the peers for its rejection, and the earl, therefore, fell back on the tactics of Pym. A bold remonstrance was prepared in the commons. The city of London, in which Shaftesbury's popularity had now risen to its greatest height, was ready with an address to the two houses in favor of the bill. All Charles could do was to gain time by a sudden prorogation of the parliament, and by its dissolution at the end of May. But delay would have been useless had the country party remained at one. The temper of the nation and of the house of commons was so hotly pronounced in favor of the exclusion of the duke that but for the disunion among the ministers it must, in the end, have been secured. England would then have been spared the necessity for the revolution of 1688. Though the disunion grew greater and hotter, indeed, the wiser leaders of the country party were already leaning to the very change which the revolution brought about. If James were passed over, his daughter Mary, the wife of the Prince of Orange, stood next in the order of succession; and the plan devised by Temple, Lord Essex, and Lord

Halifax, after the failure of their bill of securities, was to bring the prince over to England during the prorogation, to introduce him into the council, and to pave his way to the throne.

1259. Unhappily, Shaftesbury was contemplating a very different course. Ever since William had set aside his proposals in 1674, and, above all, since his marriage with the duke's daughter, Shaftesbury had looked on the Prince of Orange as a mere adherent of the royal house and a supporter of royal plans. He saw, too, that firm as was William's Protestantism, he was as jealous as Charles himself of any weakening of the royal power or invasion of the royal prerogative. Shaftesbury's keen wit was already looking forward to the changes which a few years were to bring about; and his motive for setting aside William's claims is probably to be found in the maxim ascribed to him, that "a bad title makes a good king." Whatever were his motives, however, he had resolved not only to set aside the claims of the duke and the duke's children, Mary and Anne, as well as William's own claim as grandson of Charles the First, but to place the Duke of Monmouth on the throne Monmouth was the eldest of the king's bastards, a weak and worthless profligate in temper, but popular through his personal beauty and his reputation for bravery. The tale was set about of a secret marriage between the king and his mother which would have made him lawful heir to the throne, and Shaftesbury brought him into public notice by inducing the king to put him at the head of the troops sent to repress a rising of the extreme covenanters which broke out

at this moment in the western counties of Scotland. Monmouth showed courage in routing the insurgents at Bothwell Brig, on the Clyde, as well as judgment in the mercy he extended to them after their defeat; and, on his return, Shaftesbury pressed the king to give him the command of the guards, which would have put the only military force possessed by the crown in Monmouth's hands.

1260. Sunderland, Halifax, and Essex, on the other hand—for Temple took less and less part in public affairs—were not only steadily opposed to Shaftesbury's project, but saw themselves marked out for ruin in the event of its success. They had advised the dissolution of the last parliament; and the earl's anger had vented itself in threats that the advisers of the dissolution should pay for it with their heads. The danger came home to them, when a sudden illness of the king and the absence of James made Monmouth's accession a possible contingency. The three ministers at once induced Charles to recall the Duke of York; and, though he withdrew to Scotland on the king's recovery, Charles deprived Monmouth of his charge as captain-general of the forces, and ordered him, like James, to leave the realm. Left alone in his cause by the opposition of his colleagues, Shaftesbury threw himself more and more on the support of the plot. The prosecution of its victims was pushed recklessly on. Three Catholics were hanged in London. Eight priests were put to death in the country. Pursuivants and informers spread terror through every Catholic household. He counted on the reassembling of the parliament to bring

all this terror to bear upon the king. But Charles had already marked the breach which the earl's policy had made in the ranks of the country party. He saw that Shaftesbury was unsupported by any of his colleagues, save Russell. To Temple, Essex, or Halifax, it seemed possible to bring about the succession of Mary without any violent revolution; but to set aside the rights not only of James, but of his Protestant children, and even of the Prince of Orange, was to insure a civil war. It was with their full support, therefore, that Charles, in October, 1679, deprived Shaftesbury of his post of lord president of the council.

1261. The dismissal was the signal for a struggle to whose danger Charles was far from blinding himself. What had saved him till now was his cynical courage. In the midst of the terror and panic of the plot men "wondered to see him quite cheerful amid such an intricacy of troubles," says the courtly Reresby; "but it was not in his nature to think or perplex himself much about anything." Even in the heat of the tumult which followed on Shaftesbury's dismissal Charles was seen fishing and sauntering as usual in Windsor park. But closer observers than Reresby saw beneath this veil of indolent unconcern a consciousness of new danger. "From this time," says Burnet, "his temper was observed to change very visibly." He became, in fact, "sullen and thoughtful; he saw that he had to do with a strange sort of people, that could neither be managed nor frightened." But he faced the danger with his old unscrupulous coolness. He reopened secret negotiations with

France. Louis was as alarmed as Charles himself at the warlike temper of the nation and as anxious to prevent the calling of a parliament; but the terms on which he offered a subsidy were too humiliating even for the king's acceptance. The failure forced him to summon a new parliament; and the panic which Shaftesbury was busily feeding with new tales of massacre and invasion returned members even more violent than the members of the house he had just dismissed. The project of Monmouth's succession was pressed with more daring than ever. Pamphlets appeared in open support of his claim. The young duke himself suddenly quitted Holland and reappeared at court; and though Charles forced him after a time to leave London, he refused to leave England altogether. Shaftesbury counted on the new parliament to back the duke's claim, and a host of petitions called on the king to suffer it to meet at the opening of 1680. Even the council shrank from the king's proposal to prorogue its assembly to the coming November. But Charles prorogued it in the teeth of his counselors. Alone as he stood he was firm in his resolve to gain time, for time, as he saw, was working in his favor. The tide of public sympathy was beginning to turn. The perjury of Oates was proving too much at last for the credulity of juries; and the acquittal of four of his victims showed that the panic was beginning to ebb. A far stronger proof of this was seen in the immense efforts which Shaftesbury made to maintain a belief in the plot. Fresh informers were brought forward to swear to a conspiracy for the assassination of the earl

himself and to the share of the Duke of York in the designs of his fellow-religionists. A paper found in a meal tub was produced as evidence of the new danger. Gigantic torchlight processions paraded the streets of London, and the effigy of the pope was burnt amid the wild outcry of a vast multitude.

1262. Acts of yet greater daring showed the lengths to which Shaftesbury was ready to go. He had grown up amid the tumults of civil war, and gray-headed as he was, the fire and vehemence of his early days seemed to wake again in the recklessness with which he drove on the nation to a struggle in arms. Early in 1680 he formed a committee for promoting agitation throughout the country; and the petitions which it drew up for the assembly of the parliament were sent to every town and grand jury, and sent back again with thousands of signatures. Monmouth, in spite of the king's orders, returned at Shaftesbury's call to London; and a daring pamphlet pointed him out as the nation's leader in the coming struggle "against popery and tyranny." So great was the alarm of the council that the garrison in every fortress was held in readiness for instant war. But the danger was really less than it seemed. The tide of opinion had fairly turned. Acquittal followed acquittal. A reaction of horror and remorse at the cruelty which had hurried victim after victim to the gallows succeeded to the pitiless frenzy which Shaftesbury had fanned into a flame. Anxious as the nation was for a Protestant sovereign its sense of justice revolted against the wrong threatened to James's Protestant children: and every gentleman in

the realm felt insulted at the project of setting Mary aside to put the crown of England on the head of a royal bastard.

1263. The memory, too, of the civil war was still fresh and keen, and the rumor of an outbreak of revolt rallied men more and more round the king. The host of petitions which Shaftesbury procured from the counties was answered by a counter-host of addresses from thousands who declared their "abhorrence" of the plan against the crown; and the country saw itself divided into two great factions of "petitioners" and "abhorrers," the germs of the two great parties which have played so prominent a part in our political history from the time of the exclusion bill. It was now, indeed, that these parties began to receive the names of whig and tory by which they were destined to be known. Each was originally a term of reproach. "Whig" was the name given to the extreme covenanters of the west of Scotland, and, in applying it to the members of the country party, the "abhorrer" meant to stigmatize them as rebels and fanatics. "Tory" was at this time the name for a native Irish outlaw or "bog-trotter;" and in fastening it on the loyalist adherents of James's cause the "petitioner" meant to brand the duke and his party as the friends of Catholic rebels.

1264. Charles at once took advantage of this turn of affairs. He recalled the Duke of York to the court. He received the resignation of Lord Russell as well as those of Lord Cavendish and the Earl of Essex, who had at last gone over to Shaftesbury's projects "with all his heart." Temple had all but

withdrawn from the council; and public affairs were now left in the hands of Lord Sunderland and Lord Halifax, of Godolphin, a laborious financier, and of Laurence Hyde, a younger son of Lord Clarendon. Shaftesbury met the king's defiance with as bold a defiance of his own. Followed by a crowd of his adherents he attended before the grand jury of Middlesex to indict the Duke of York as a Catholic recusant and the king's mistress, the Duchess of Portsmouth, as a national nuisance, while Monmouth made a progress through the country and gained favor everywhere by his winning demeanor. Above all, Shaftesbury relied on the temper of the commons, elected as they had been in the very heat of the panic and irritated by the long delay in calling the houses together.

1265. At this moment, however, a new and formidable opponent to Shaftesbury's plans presented himself in the Prince of Orange. The position of William had for some time been one of singular difficulty. He had been forced, and chiefly through the treacherous diplomacy of Charles the Second, to consent to the treaty of Nimegwen which left France matchless in arms and dominant over Europe as she had never been before. Holland, indeed, was saved from the revenge of Louis, but fresh spoils had been wrested from Spain, and Franche Comté, which had been restored at the close of the former war, was retained at the end of this. Above all, France overawed Europe by the daring and success with which she had faced single-handed the wide coalition against her. From the moment when the war came

to an end her king's arrogance became unbounded. Lorraine was turned into a subject-state. Genoa was bombarded and its doge forced to seek pardon in the ante chambers of Versailles. The pope was humiliated by the march of an army upon Rome to avenge a slight offered to the French ambassador. The empire was outraged by a shameless seizure of imperial fiefs in Alsace and elsewhere which provoked remonstrances even from Charles. The whole Protestant world was defied by the increasing persecution of the Huguenots, a persecution which was to culminate in the revocation of the edict of Nantes.

1266. In the mind of Louis peace meant a series of outrages on the powers around him; but every outrage helped the cool and silent adversary who was looking on from the Hague in his task of building up that great alliance of all Europe from which alone he looked for any effectual check to the ambition of France. The experience of the last war had taught William that of such an alliance England must form a part, and the efforts of the prince ever since the peace had been directed to secure her co-operation. A reconciliation of the king with his parliament was an indispensable step toward freeing Charles from his dependence on France, and it was such a reconciliation that William at first strove to bring about; but he was for a long time foiled by the steadiness with which Charles clung to the power whose aid was needful to carry out the schemes which he was contemplating. The change of policy, however, which followed on the fall of the cabal and the entry of Danby into power, raised new hopes in William's

mind, and his marriage with Mary dealt Louis what proved to be a fatal blow. James was without a son, and the marriage with Mary would, at any rate, insure William the aid of England in his great enterprise on his father-in-law's death. But it was impossible to wait for that event, and though the prince used his new position to bring Charles round to a decided policy his efforts remained fruitless. The storm of the popish plot complicated his position. In the earlier stages of the exclusion bill, when the parliament seemed resolved simply to pass over James and to seat Mary at once on the throne after her uncle's death, William stood apart from the struggle, doubtful of its issue, though prepared to accept the good luck if it came to him. But the fatal error of Shaftesbury in advancing the claims of Monmouth forced him into action. To preserve his wife's right of succession, with all the great issues which were to come of it, as well as to secure his own, no other course was left than to adopt the cause of the Duke of York. Charles, too, seemed at last willing to purchase the support of the prince in England by a frank adhesion to his policy abroad. He protested against the encroachments which Louis was making in Germany. He promised aid to Holland in case of attack. He listened with favor to William's proposal of a general alliance of the European powers, and opened negotiations for that purpose with Brandenburg and Spain. William, indeed, believed that the one step now needed to bring England to his side in the coming struggle with Louis was a reconciliation between Charles and the parliament, grounded on

the plan for providing Protestant securities which Charles was ready again to bring forward.

1267. But he still remained in an attitude of reserve when the parliament at last met in October. The temper of the commons was as bitter as Shaftesbury had hoped. It was in vain that Charles informed them of his negotiations for an European alliance and called on them to support him by reason and moderation. The house was too full of the sense of danger at home to heed dangers abroad. Its first act was to vote that its care should be "to suppress popery and prevent a popish successor." Rumors of a Catholic plot in Ireland were hardly needed to set aside all schemes of Protestant securities and to push the exclusion bill through the commons without a division. So strong had Monmouth's party become that a proposal to affirm the rights of Mary and William by name in the bill was evaded and put aside. From this moment the course of the prince became clear. So resolute was the temper of the lower house that even Temple and Essex now gave their adhesion to the exclusion bill as a necessity, and Sunderland himself wavered toward accepting it. But Halifax, whose ability and eloquence had now brought him fairly to the front, opposed it resolutely and successfully in the lords; and Halifax was out the mouth-piece of William. "My Lord Halifax is entirely in the interest of the prince of Orange," the French ambassador, Barillon, wrote to his master; "and what he seems to be doing for the Duke of York is really in order to make an opening for a compromise by which the Prince of Orange may

benefit." The exclusion bill once rejected, Halifax followed up the blow by bringing forward a plan of Protestant securities which would have taken from James on his accession the right of veto on any bill passed by the two houses, the right of negotiating with foreign states, or of appointing either civil or military officers save with the consent of parliament. This plan, like his opposition to the exclusion, was, no doubt, prompted by the Prince of Orange; and the states of Holland supported it by pressing Charles to come to an accommodation with his subjects which would enable them to check the perpetual aggressions which France was making on her neighbors.

1268. But if the lords would have no exclusion bill, the commons, with as good reason, would have no securities bill. They felt—as one of the members for London fairly put it—that such securities would break down at the very moment they were needed. A Catholic king, should he ever come to the throne, would have other forces besides those in England to back him. "The duke rules over Scotland; the Irish and the English papists will follow him; he will be obeyed by the officials of high and low rank whom the king has appointed; he will be just such a king as he thinks good." Shaftesbury, however, was far from resting in a merely negative position. He made a despairing effort to do the work of exclusion by a bill of divorce, which would have enabled Charles to put away his queen on the ground of barrenness, and by a fresh marriage to give a Protestant heir to the throne. The earl's course shows that he felt the weakness of Monmouth's cause; and, perhaps, that

he was already sensible of a change in public feeling. This, however, Shaftesbury resolved to check and turn by a great public impeachment which would revive and establish the general belief in the plot. Lord Stafford, who from his age and rank was looked on as the leader of the Catholic party, had lain a prisoner in the Tower since the first outburst of popular frenzy. He was now solemnly impeached; and his trial in December, 1680, mustered the whole staff of informers to prove the truth of a Catholic conspiracy against the king and the realm. The evidence was worthless; but the trial revived, as Shaftesbury had hoped, much of the old panic; and the condemnation of the prisoner by a majority of his peers was followed by his death on the scaffold. The blow produced its effect on all but Charles. Sunderland again pressed the king to give way. But deserted as he was by his ministers and even by his mistress, for the Duchess of Portsmouth had been cowed into supporting the exclusion by the threats of Shaftesbury, Charles was determined to resist. On the coupling of a grant of supplies with demands for a voice in the appointment of officers of the royal garrisons he prorogued the parliament.

1269. William's policy had failed to bring the commons round to the king's plans, and Charles sullenly turned again to France. All dreams of heading Europe in her strife against Louis were set aside. Charles became deaf to the projects of the Prince of Orange, and listened to the remonstrances which James addressed to him through his favorite Churchill in favor of an alliance with the Catholic king. With

characteristic subtlety, however, he dissolved the existing parliament and called a new one to meet in March, 1681. The act was a mere blind. The king's aim was to frighten the country into reaction by the dread of civil strife; and his summons of the parliament to Oxford was an appeal to the country against the disloyalty of the capital and an adroit means of reviving the memories of the civil war. With the same end he ordered his guards to accompany him on the pretext of anticipated disorder; and Shaftesbury, himself terrified at the projects of the court, aided the king's designs by appearing with his followers in arms on the plea of self-protection. The violence of the earl's party only strengthened the resolution of the king. Monmouth renewed his progresses through the country, and was met by deputations and addresses in every town he visited. London was so restless that riots broke out in its streets. Revolt seemed at hand, and Charles hastened to conclude his secret negotiations with France. Louis was as ready for an agreement as Charles. The one king verbally pledged himself to a policy of peace, in other words, to withdrawal from any share in the grand alliance which William was building up. The other promised a small subsidy, which, with the natural growth of the royal revenue, sufficed to render Charles, if he remained at peace, independent of parliamentary aids.

1270. It was with this arrangement already concluded that Charles met his parliament at Oxford. The members of the house of commons were the same as those who had been returned to the parliaments he

had just dissolved, and their temper was naturally imbittered by the two dissolutions. But their violence simply played into the king's hands. William's party still had hopes of bringing about a compromise; but the rejection of a new limitation bill brought forward by Halifax, which, while conceding to James the title of king, would have vested the actual functions of government in the Prince and Princess of Orange during his reign, alienated the more moderate and sensible of the country party. They were alienated still more by a bold appeal of Shaftesbury to Charles himself to recognize Monmouth as his successor. The attempt of the lower house to revive the panic by impeaching an informer named Fitzharris before the house of lords, in defiance of the constitutional rule which entitled him, as a commoner, to a trial by his peers in the course of common law, did still more to throw public opinion on the side of the crown. Shaftesbury's course, in fact, went wholly on a belief that the penury of the treasury left Charles at his mercy, and that a refusal of supplies must wring from the king his assent to the exclusion. But the gold of France had freed the king from his thraldom. He had used the parliament simply to exhibit himself as a sovereign whose patience and conciliatory temper were rewarded with insult and violence; and now that his end was accomplished, he no sooner saw the exclusion bill reintroduced into the commons than he suddenly dissolved the houses after but a month's sitting, and appealed, in a royal declaration, to the justice of the nation at large.

1271. The appeal was met by an almost universal burst of loyalty. The church rallied to the king; his declaration was read from every pulpit; and the universities solemnly decided that "no religion, no law, no fault, no forfeiture," could avail to bar the sacred right of hereditary succession. The arrest of Shaftesbury on a charge of suborning false witnesses to the plot marked the new strength of the crown. The answer of the nation at large was uttered in the first great poem of John Dryden. Born in 1631, of a good Northamptonshire family, Dryden had grown up, amid the tumult of the civil wars, in a Puritan household. His grandfather, Sir Erasmus Dryden, had gone to prison at seventy rather than contribute to a forced loan. His father had been a committeeman and sequestrator under the commonwealth. He entered life under the protection of a cousin, Sir Gilbert Pickering, who sat as one of the judges at the king's trial. Much of this early training lived in Dryden to the last. He never freed himself from the Puritan sense of religion, from the Puritan love for theological discussion and ecclesiastical controversy. Two of his greatest poems, the "Religio Laici," and the "Hind and Panther," are simply theological treatises in verse. Nor did the commonwealth's man ever die in him. "All good subjects," he could say boldly in an hour of royal triumph, "abhor arbitrary power, whether in one or in many;" and no writer has embodied in more pregnant words the highest claim of a people's right, that

> right supreme
> To make their kings, for kings are made for them.

Dryden grew up, too, amid the last echoes of the Elizabethan verse. Jonson and Massinger, Webster and Shirley, were still living men in his childhood. The lyrics of Herrick, the sweet fancies of George Herbert, were fresh in men's ears as he grew to manhood. Even when he entered into the new world of the restoration, some veterans of this nobler school, like Denham and Waller, were still lingering on the stage. The fullness and imaginative freedom of Elizabethan prose lived on till 1677 in Jeremy Taylor, while Clarendon preserved to yet later years the grandeur and stateliness of its march. Above all, Milton still sat musing on the Paradise Lost in the tapestried chamber of his house, in Bunhill Fields.

1272. Throughout his life, something of the spirit of the age, which he was the last to touch, lived on in Dryden. He loved and studied Chaucer and Spenser, even while he was copying Molière and Corneille. His noblest panegyric was pronounced over Shakespeare. At the time when Rymer, the accepted critic of the restoration, declared "our poetry of the last age as rude as our architecture," and sneered at "that Paradise Lost of Milton's which some are pleased to call a poem," Dryden saw in it "one of the greatest, most noble, and sublime poems which either this age or nation hath produced." But whether in mind or in life, Dryden was as unlike the Elizabethans as he was in his earlier years unlike the men of the poetic school which followed him. Of that school, the critical school, as it has been called, of English poetry, he was, indeed, the founder. He is the first of our great poets in whom "fancy is but

the feather of the pen." Whether he would or no, Dryden's temper was always intellectual. He was a poet, for, if dead to the subtler and more delicate forms of imaginative delight, he loved grandeur, and his amazing natural force enabled him to realize in great part the grandeur which he loved. But beneath all his poetry lay a solid bottom of reason. His wildest outbursts of passion are broken by long passages of cool argument. His heroes talk to his heroines in a serried dialectic. Every problem of morals, of religion, of politics, forces itself into his verse, and is treated there in the same spirit of critical inquiry.

1273. In other words, Dryden was the poet of his day. But he was the poet of a time of transition, and his temper is transitional. It was only by slow and uncertain steps that he advanced to the full rationalism of the critical school. His first little poem, some verses written in 1659 on the death of Lord Hastings, is a mass of grotesque extravagances in the worst style of Donne. The dramas of his early work, after the restoration, are crowded with the bombastic images, the affected conceits, the far-fetched metaphors, which it is the merit of the critical school to have got rid of. In his tragedies, indeed, the tradition of a freer and larger time jarred against the unities and the critical rules with which he strove to bind himself. If he imitated the foreign stage he could not be blind to the fact that the Elizabethan playwrights possessed "a more masculine fancy, and a greater spirit in the writing, than there is in any of the French." He followed Corneille. but he was

haunted by memories of "the divine Shakespeare.' His failure, indeed, sprang from the very truth of his poetic ideal. He could not be imaginative in the highest dramatic sense, but the need of imaginativeness pressed on him, while it was ceasing to press on his brother playwrights. He could not reach the sublime, but neither could he content himself, as they did, with the prosaic; he rants, fumes, and talks wild bombast in the vain effort after sublimity.

1274. Dryden failed in comedy as he failed in tragedy, but here the failure sprang from the very force and vigor of his mind. He flung himself, like the men of his day, into the reaction against Puritanism. His life was that of a libertine; and his marriage with a woman of fashion, who was yet more dissolute than himself, only gave a new spur to his debaucheries. Large as was his income from the stage, and it equaled for many years the income of a country squire, he was always in debt and forced to squeeze gifts from patrons by fulsome adulation. Like the rest of the fine gentlemen about him, he aired his Hobbism in sneers at the follies of religion and the squabbles of creeds. The grossness of his comedies rivaled that of Wycherley himself. But it is the very extravagance of his coarseness which shows how alien it was to the real temper of the man. A keen French critic has contrasted the libertinism of England under the restoration with the libertinism of France, and has ruthlessly pointed out how the gayety, the grace, the naturalness, of the one disappears in the forced, hard, brutal brilliancy of the other. The contrast is a just one. The vice of the English

libertine was hard and unnatural, just because his real nature took little share in it. In sheer revolt against the past, he was playing a part which was not his own and which he played badly, which he forced and exaggerated, just because it was not his own. Dryden scoffs at priests and creeds, but his greater poetry is colored throughout with religion. He plays the rake, but the two pictures which he has painted with all his heart are the pictures of the honest country squire and the poor country parson. He passes his rivals in the grossness of his comedies; he flings himself recklessly into the evil about him, because it is the fashion, and because it pays. But he cannot sport lightly and gayly with what is foul. He is driven, if he is coarse at all, to be brutally coarse. His freedom of tone, to borrow Scott's fine remark, is like the forced impudence of a timid man.

1275. Slowly but ceaselessly, however, the critical taste of his time told on Dryden. The poetry of good sense, as it proudly called itself, triumphed in Boileau, and the rules of taste and form which Boileau laid down were accepted as the law of letters on the one side of the channel as well as on the other. Andrew Marvell, in whom the older imaginative beauty still found a worshiper, stood alone in his laughter at the degradation of poetry into prose. Fancy was set aside for reason, "that substantial useful part which gains the head, while fancy wins the heart." It was the head and not the heart that poetry now cared to gain. But with all its prose the new criticism did a healthy work in insisting on clearness, simplicity, and good sense. In his "Rehearsal"

Buckingham quizzed fairly enough the fume and bombast of Dryden's tragedies. But Dryden was already echoing his critics' prayer for a year "of prose and sense." He was tired of being "the Sisyphus of the stage, to roll up a stone with endless labor which is perpetually falling down again." "To the stage," he owned, "my genius never much inclined me," and he had long had dreams, stirred no doubt by his admiration for Milton, of undertaking some epic story. But need held him to the boards and years passed by, and Dryden still stood in the second rank of English poetry, outdone in comedy by men like Etherege and rivaled in tragedy by men like Settle. Only in a single poem, that of the "Annus Mirabilis," in 1671, had he given any true indications of his surpassing powers.

1276. It was in this mood of failure and disappointment that the popish plot found him. Of its reality he made no question; "a plot," he says emphatically, "there was." But his cool good sense saw how the truth had been "dashed and brewed with lies." What stirred him more was, as he believed, the return of anarchy. Puritan as his training had been, he had grown up like the bulk of the men about him with a horror of the social and religious disorders which the civil war had brought in its train. He clung to authority as a security against revolution. It was this that drove him from the Puritanism of his youth to the Anglican dogmatism of the "Religio Laici," and from thence to the tempered Catholicism of the "Hind and Panther." It was this which made him sing by turns the praises of

Cromwell and the praises of the king whom Cromwell had hunted from one refuge to another. No man denounced the opponents of the crown with more ruthless invective. No man humbled himself before the throne with more fulsome adulation. Some of this, no doubt, was mere flattery, but not all of it. Dryden, like his age, was conscious that new currents of feeling and opinion were sweeping him from the old moorings of mankind. But he shrank in terror from the wide ocean over whose waters he drifted. In religion he was a rationalist, a skeptic, whether he would or no; but he recoiled from the maze of "anxious thoughts" which spread before him, of thoughts "that in endless circles roll without a center where to fix the soul," and clung to the church that would give him, if not peace, at least quiet. In politics he was as much a rationalist as in religion, but he turned horror-struck from the sight of a "state drawn to the dregs of a democracy," and in the crisis of the popish plot he struck blindly for the crown.

1277. Dryden, like the royalists generally, believed that the arrest of Shaftesbury had alone saved England from civil war, and from that worst of civil wars where a son fights against his father's throne. In his "Absalom and Ahitophel" the poet told the story of the threatened strife under the thin veil of the revolt against David. Charles was the Hebrew king, Monmouth was Absalom, Shaftesbury was the wily Ahitophel who drew him into revolt. The "Absalom" was a satire, and it was the first great English satire, for the satires of Marston and Hall were

already forgotten. It is in ages, indeed, like the restoration that satire naturally comes to the front. In the reaction after a time of high ideals and lofty efforts the sense of contrast between the aims and the powers of man, between his hopes and their fulfillment, takes form, whether in the kindly pitifulness of humor or in the bitter revulsion of satire. And mingled with this in Dryden was an honest indignation at the hypocrisy around him. The men he attacks are not real men, but actors. Buckingham and Shaftesbury, the infidel leader of the Independents and the deistical leader of the Presbyterians, were alike playing a part. But the largeness and fairness of his temper saved Dryden's satire from the vicious malignity of that of Pope. He has an artistic love of picturesque contrast, he has a great writer's pride in the consciousness of power. But he has no love of giving pain for the mere pain's sake, and he has a hatred of unfairness. Even in his contempt for the man he is just to Buckingham, and his anger does not blind him to the great qualities of Shaftesbury.

1278. The even and effortless force of the poem, the disappearance of inequalities and faults of taste, showed that Dryden was at last master of his powers. But it was not this nervous strength alone which suddenly brought him to the forefront of English letters. It was the general sense that his "Absalom" was the opening of a new literary development. Its verse, free from the old poetic merits as from the old poetic faults, clear, nervous, condensed, argumentative, proclaimed the final triumph of the "poetry of good sense." Its series of portraits showed the new

interest in human character which had been stirred by the civil war, and which was deepening with the growing indifference to larger thoughts of nature and the growing concentration of man's thoughts on man. They led the way to that delight in the analysis of character, in its lowest as in its highest forms, which produced the essayists and the novel. Above all, the "Absalom" was the first work in which literature became a great political power. In it Dryden showed himself the precursor of Swift and of Bolingbroke, of Burke and of Cobbett. The poem was bought eagerly, and it undoubtedly helped to bring about that triumph of the king with the prophecy of which it closed. But, prisoner as Shaftesbury was, the struggle with him was not yet over. London was still true to him; only a few days after the appearance of the "Absalom and Ahitophel" the Middlesex grand jury ignored the bill of his indictment, and his discharge from the Tower was welcomed in every street with bonfires and ringing of bells. But a fresh impulse was given to the loyal enthusiasm of the country at large by the publication of a plan said to have been found among his papers, the plan of a secret association for the furtherance of the exclusion, whose members bound themselves to obey the orders of parliament even after its prorogation or dissolution by the crown. So general was the reaction that Halifax, who had now become the most conspicuous member of the royal council, though scared by the whig threats of impeachment, advised the calling of a new parliament in the belief that it would be a loyal one. William of Orange, too, visited England

to take advantage of the turn of affairs to pin Charles to the policy of the alliance.

1279. The king met both counsels with evasion. He kept his own secret. Hyde was the only one of his ministers whom he had trusted with the knowledge of his French negotiations and they remained as unknown to William as to Halifax. But heir effect was seen in the new vigor which Louis gave to his policy at home and abroad. He was resolved to bring about national unity by crushing the French Protestants, to gain a strong frontier to the east, and to be ready to seize the Spanish heritage on the death of Charles the Fourth. The agreement was no sooner made with Charles than persecution fell heavy on the Huguenots; and the seizure of Strasbourg and Casale, the keys of Germany and Italy, with that of Luxemburg, the key of the united provinces, brought Europe to the verge of war. Charles, indeed, was anxious to avoid war and he was as anxious to avoid parliaments whose assembly war would certainly force upon him as Louis himself. The tide of loyal reaction was mounting, in fact, higher every day. The king secured the adhesion of the church by a renewed persecution of the non-conformists, which drove Penn from England and thus brought about the settlement of Pennsylvania as a refuge for his fellow-Quakers. He was soon strong enough to call back James to court and to arrest Monmouth, who had resumed his almost royal progresses as a means of again stirring opinion in his favor. London alone remained firm for the whigs; but the friendship of a tory mayor secured the nomination of tory sheriffs in

the summer of 1682, and the juries they packed left the life of every exclusionist at the mercy of the crown. Shaftesbury saw himself threatened with ruin. It was in vain that he offered to waive his plans of exclusion and to fall in with the king's older proposals of a limited monarchy in the case of James's accession. The loss of London left him without a shelter and drove him to wild conspiracies with a handful of adventurers, who were as desperate as himself. He hid himself in the city, where he boasted that 10,000 "brisk boys" were ready to appear at his call. From his hiding-place he urged his friends to rise in arms. But their delays drove him to flight; and in January, 1683, two months after his arrival in Holland, the soul of the great leader, great from his immense energy and the wonderful versatility of his genius, but whose genius and energy had ended in wrecking for the time the fortunes of English freedom and in associating the noblest causes with the vilest of crimes, found its first quiet in death.

1280. The flight of Shaftesbury proclaimed the triumph of the king. His marvelous sagacity had told him when the struggle was over and further resistance useless. But the country leaders who had delayed to answer the earl's call still believed opposition possible, and looked for support to the discontent of the non-conformists at the revival of the penal laws. Monmouth, with Lord Essex, Lord Howard of Ettrick, Lord Russell, Hampden, and Algernon Sidney, held meetings with the view of founding an association whose agitation should force on the king the assembly of a parliament. The more desperate

spirits who had clustered round Shaftesbury as he lay hidden in the city took refuge in plots of assassination and in a plan for murdering Charles and his brother as they passed the Rye-house on the road from London to Newmarket. Both projects were betrayed, and though they were wholly distinct from one another, the cruel ingenuity of the crown lawyers blended them into one. Lord Essex saved himself from a traitor's death by suicide in the Tower. Lord Russell, convicted on a charge of sharing in the Rye-house plot, was beheaded on the 21st of July, 1683, in front of his father, the Earl of Bedford's house, in Lincoln's Inn Fields. The same fate awaited Algernon Sidney. Monmouth fled in terror over sea, and his flight was followed by a series of prosecutions for sedition directed against his followers.

"There is a world of sense and practical truth in this valuable book."—*The Brooklyn Eagle.*

A Bundle of Letters To Busy Girls.

By MISS GRACE E. DODGE,

(*Member of the New York Board of Education*).

"These Twelve Letters are all on 'Practical Matters' which enter into the life of all our 'Girls.' . . . All is subordinated to produce wise, practical, and much-needed instruction, in plain, common-sense, brief, and wonderfully effective words. They are indeed a model. The author, as one of the 'Girls,' puts herself on their level, and speaks in their language, and voices their feelings, wants, and trials. Nothing could be more wisely done, for the object in view. The little book can not fail to do great good to the class of girls for whom it has been prepared. Let it be circulated."—*The Christian Observer, Louisville.*

"Some philanthropic person ought to see this book put into the hands of thousands of school and shop girls throughout the country. It would be a bit of philanthropy that would bear more moral fruit than often comes from the charitable endeavor."—*The Journal of Education, Boston.*

"No class of girls can be more usefully employed than in reading and discussing the points suggested in this excellent book."—*Woman's Journal, Boston.*

"It is one of the best and most helpful books I ever read. It is written with charming directness and simplicity."—"*Josiah Allen's Wife.*"

16mo. Cloth. Price, 50 Cents. Half Cloth, Fancy Sides, Uncut Edges, $1.00. Post-free.

Funk & Wagnalls Company, 44-60 E. 23d St., New York.

A Charming Book.

My Musical Memories

By REV. H. R. HAWEIS, A.M.,

AUTHOR OF "AMERICAN HUMORISTS," ETC., ETC.

12mo, Cloth. Price, $1, Postpaid.

A volume of personal reminiscences, dealing with early Life and Recollections, Hearing Music, Old Violins, Paganini, Wagner, "Parsifal," Liszt, and other kindred subjects, in a manner both artistic and pleasing, which shows the author to be a person of great critical ability in the realm of music. He is an enthusiast, for music hath charms, so hath its memories; but his enthusiasm never carries him beyond the bounds of good sense and fair judgment.

"Of all Mr. Haweis' contributions to musical literature none is richer or more readable than 'My Musical Memories'; in short, it is a treasury of musical intelligence such as only a critical taste and an almost infallible instinct could have gathered."—*The Musical Herald, Boston.*

"Those who know the charm and clearness of Mr. Haweis' style in descriptive musical essays will need no commendation of these 'Memories,' which are not only vivid but critical."—*The Public Ledger, Phila.*

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY, Publishers,
44-60 East 23d Street, New York.

Edwin Arnold

• • • AS • • •

Poetizer and as Paganizer.

Containing an Examination of "The Light of Asia" for its Literature and for its Buddhism.

By Prof. William Cleaver Wilkinson, D.D.

12mo, 177 pp. Cloth, 75 cts., Post-free.

This book must prove of continued usefulness in laying bare some of the discrepancies of the poem which has wielded so wide an influence, as also in disclosing some of the most questionable teachings of the ism that holds so vast a sway. The following from the comments of the press will indicate the scope and merit of the work:

"It must be regarded as a complete refutation of the alleged claims of Buddhism to a position of substantial equality with Christianity."—*Tribune*, Chicago.

"As a piece of destructive criticism it is unsurpassed in English literature."—*Examiner*, New York.

"Mr. Wilkinson strikes his foe with a smile and a bow, and with true knightly good nature, but his rapier is sharp both at the point and along the edge. . . . He deserves well for his assiduous examination into the facts, and for the full and complete way in which he has gone over the whole poem."—*The Independent*, New York.

Price, together with Manila-bound copy of "The Light of Asia," 90c., post-free.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY,

44-60 East 23d Street, New York.

By ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.

Catharine of Siena

The Life Story of a Wonderful Woman.

The life of Catharine of Siena is one of the most wonderful and fascinating biographies in medieval history. In the midst of ecclesiastical corruption this "daughter of the people" rose to be a tower of strength for purifying the church and ministering to the people. With a faith which swept all before it, her influence swayed cardinals, princes, and popes, and she acted as mediator between Church and State. The interesting story of her life is told in this volume.

Southern Star, Atlanta, Ga.: "There is an especial fitness in bringing to the front such a woman preacher in the day when godly women are fast coming into real prominence as workers in the mission field at home and abroad, and when the sisterhood of the race seems to be for the first time mounting to the true throne of woman's influence and kingdom."

Epworth Herald, Chicago: "Her story ought, if widely read, to arouse in the women of to-day a desire to emulate the virtues of their illustrious sister of the past."

The Living Church, Chicago: "How few in our day, even among our high school and college graduates, know anything about this devoted woman."

Christian Herald, Detroit, Mich.: "The story is well told by Dr. Pierson, whose own piety is of the same mystical but evangelical type."

The Boston Times: "The modern woman striving for nobler things will be helped by this sketch."

Pittsburg Christian Advocate: "Its pages are brimful of inspiration, while at the same time they narrate a history most thrilling and ennobling."

12mo, Cloth, Cover Design.
Price, 50 cents, post-paid.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY, Publishers,
44-60 East 23d Street, New York.

DA 30 G79 V-8
GREEN JOHN RICHARD 1837-1883
A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH
PEOPLE
NL 40878024 CURR HIST

